

(1)
sons are at Oxford, yet their Fathers good Common-
wealthes men. I can heare no certainty of any further
news from the *Scotts*, then what I have before declared,
and although there is now extant a report that the *Scotts*
have lately taken 700. Common Souldiers, and five Troops
of horse, yet I cannot assure it for truth. Many there are that
upon the report of *Hoptons* comming to *London*, gave out that
his Journey if so intended was stopt by Messengers from
Oxford, and that he was Commanded to make his repaire
thither, and the reason as I can gather is thus, that for his
neglect and cowardlinesse in not sending timely releife to *Ar-*
undell Castle, and carelessly suffering *Sir William Waller* to take
the 200. and odd Prisoners at *Olton*, in *Hampshire* his great-
nesse is sent for, and proclaimed Traitor and to be tryed by
a Councell of Warre, but my beleefe in this, is as the first.

For further news from the Northern parts by letters
from *Sir John Meldrum* to his Excellency the Earle of *Essex*
and read in the House of Commons, on Wednesday we
have certaine intelligence, that *Sir John Meldrum* with a con-
siderable partie from *Hull*, entred the Isle of *Ajax* and by a
valliant encounter gained a great worke raised by the Ene-
my there and eight peeces of Ordnance, a Troope of Horse
and their Armes with divers Prisoners of note, and further
tooke in the River, six small Barks, or Barges, with flat Bo-
toms covered over the top, laden with Corne and other
Marchandize, intended for the Enemy at *Newark*, and proved
a good pize to supply *Sir John Meldrums* Forces and out
party at *Hull*.

This is Licensed and entered according to Order.

(1)
sons are at Oxford, yet their Fathers good Common-
wealthes men. I can heare no certainty of any further
news from the *Scotts*, then what I have before declared,
and although there is now extant a report that the *Scotts*
have lately taken 700. Common Souldiers, and five Troops
of horse, yet I cannot assure it for truth. Many there are that
upon the report of *Hoptons* comming to *London*, gave out that
his Journey if so intended was stopt by Messengers from
Oxford, and that he was Commanded to make his repaire
thither, and the reason as I can gather is thus, that for his
neglect and cowardlinesse in not sending timely releife to *Ar-*
undell Castle, and carelessly suffering *Sir William Waller* to take
the 200. and odd Prisoners at *Olton*, in *Hampshire* his great-
nesse is sent for, and proclaimed Traitor and to be tryed by
a Councell of Warre, but my beleefe in this, is as the first.

For further news from the Northern parts by letters
from *Sir John Meldrum* to his Excellency the Earle of *Essex*
and read in the House of Commons, on Wednesday we
have certaine intelligence, that *Sir John Meldrum* with a con-
siderable partie from *Hull*, entred the Isle of *Ajax* and by a
valliant encounter gained a great worke raised by the Ene-
my there and eight peeces of Ordnance, a Troope of Horse
and their Armes with divers Prisoners of note, and further
tooke in the River, six small Barkes, or Barges, with flat Bo-
toms covered over the top, laden with Corne and other
Marchandize, intended for the Enemy at *Newark*, and proved
a good pize to supply *Sir John Meldrums* Forces and out
party at *Hull*.

This is Licensed and entered according to Order.

2

A

CHRISTIAN PLEA

FOR

INFANTS BAPTISME.

OR

A CONFUTATION OF

some things written by *A. R.* in his
Treatise, entituled, *The second part of the*
vanitie and Childishnesse of Infants

BAPTISME.

In the Answer whereof,

The lawfulnessse of *Infants Baptisme* is de-
fended, and the Arguments against it disproved,
by sufficient grounds and forcible reasons, drawn
from the sweet fountains of holy Scripture.

S. C. X

Deut. 4. 37. *Because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed.*

Jer. 30. 20. *Their Children also shall be as aforetime.*

Isa. 65. 23. *They shall not labour in vaine, nor bring forth in feare: for they are the seed of the Blessed of the Lord, and their off-spring with them.*

Acts 2. 39. *The promise is unto you, and to your Children, and to all that are a far off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*

L O N D O N :

Printed by T. P. and M. S. and are to be sold by

Stb: 8th Ben. Allen in Popes-head-Alley. 1 6 4 3.

A
CHRISTIAN PLEA
FOR
INFANTS BAPTISM.
OR
A CONFUTATION OF

some things written by M. R. in his

Treatise, entitled, The second part of the

Treatise and Confutation of Infants

BAPTISM.



In the Assembly

The lawfulness of Infant Baptism is de-
fended, and the Arguments against it disproved,
by sufficient grounds and forcible reasons, drawn
from the sacred Scriptures of holy Scripture.

S. C.

Deut. 4. 8. 7. Because he loved thy father, therefore he chose thee.
Jer. 30. 20. Their Children shall be as a flock.
Mat. 23. 23. They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth in tears: for they
are the seed of the Blessing of the Lord, and shall be off- spring with them.
Acts 2. 39. The promise is unto you, and to your Children, and to all that are
a far off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.

LONDON:
Printed by T. P. and M. S. and are to be sold by
Ben. Allen in Paper-head-Alley. 1643.



CONFUTATION OF SOME
things written by A. R. in his Treatise,
intituled, The second part of the vanitie and
Childishnesse of Infants Baptisme.

In the Answer whereof,

The lawfulnessse of *Infants Baptisme* is defended,
 and the Arguments against it disproved, by sufficient
 grounds and forcible reasons, drawn from the
sweet fountains of holy Scripture.

M^r. *A. R.*

Y Our former Treatise (intituled, *The vanitie of Childish Baptisme*) being answered, I (according to my promise made unto you in that answer*) doe now proceed to answer this your other Treatise (which you have intituled, *The second part of the vanitie and Childishnes of Infants Baptisme.*) And (I conceive) it is the Treatise whereof you spake in your *vanitie of Childish Baptisme**, wherein you say, that the grounds which *Seperates* and some others urge for the baptizing of Infants, should be answered.

* Pag. 28. lin.
31, 32.

* Pag. 29. lin.
30, 31, 32.

And here (in the beginning of this your second part) you say, * Having formerly treated of the Baptisme of the nationall Church, you have now thought it meet likewise to consider the grounds upon which the *seperated*, and some other Churches doe baptize their Infants, which (you say) are from severall places of Scripture. But in answer to your first Treatise (pag. 27. line 26, 27, 28, 29.) I there tell you, that these [some others] besides *Seperates*, I know not who they are, and if they are not *seperated* from the unclean thing, they are still unclean.

* Pag. 1.

And though such may bring good grounds for baptizing of *Infants*, from severall places of Scripture; yet they cannot bring good groundsto warrant any *Churches* to baptize, that are not seperated from Idolatry, and doe not cleave unto *Christ* in puritie, in his visible way of worship.

But those that are so seperated indeed, may [very justly] alledge Scripture to justifie what they do in things of this nature, for of all *Churches* and people in the world, they are the most holy and sincere, yea and cleave closest to the *Rule*. And they in baptizing their *Infants*, do that whereunto they are bound by the *Covenant*, which both they and their holy seed are under.

Whereas you say, the grounds are from severall places of Scripture, especially these five, which you promise to examine in order.

I answer; I know not what five you meane, for you have not so plainly distinguished them, whereby wee may know how (in your book) to find them. But (it may be) you have not done it of set purpose, but through some over-sight; for (in pag. 3. li. 16.) you speak of a second [argument] from [places] and (in pag. 3. lin. 39.) you speak of a third [argument] (from 1 Cor. 7. 14) The fourth (in pag. 12. lin. 40.) is expressed to be the fourth Scripture. As (in pag. 1.) *Act*. 2. 39. is declared to be the first. But (in pag. 18. lin. 3.) you speake of a fifth [argument].

Now by this your disorderly manner of proceeding, it appears that you doe not performe what you promised (in pag. 1.) where you say, the grounds are from severall places of [Scripture] especially the [five,] which you there promise to examine in order.



He first (you say) is that in *Act*. 2. 39. The promise is to you and your children. But this Text (you say) is to no purpose in the poynt.

To which I reply, that this your bare affirmation will not beare the least weight in the ballance of Gods Sanctuary: for this promise spoken of by *Peter*, is the promise of eternall life, and all those who are beires of this promise, are the right Subjects of Baptisme*. But the *Infants* of beleevers are beires of this promise; for so the tenor of the whole Scripture declareth: There is no place of Scripture which describeth the blessednesse of the parents, but it also includeth their *Infants*; yea in this place *Act*. 2. 39, where beleevers children are

* *Act*. 10. 47.

mentioned, *their Infants* are meant. As shall be more clearly proved in answer to your next objections following. And this being proved, it followeth that they are the right subjects of *Baptisme*.

But you say, it is not there said of *Infants*, but to your *Children*, not *promises*, but *promise*.

To which I reply, that this your Answer is of no weight, for *Infants* are *Children* as well being young as old, and this great promise of God, includeth *promises*: for though Gods great promise (in general) be but one, yet in particular it is divers.

But seeing you say, it is worthy enquiry to know what is meant by you and your *Children*, I will (by Gods assistance) prove unto you, that it is meant of *beleevers* and *their Infants*. Consider therefore that the Apostle doth not onely distinguish them from their *parents*, by the title *Children*, and also from those *as far off*; But he likewise declareth them to be those *children* to whom the *promise* appertaineth as well as to the *parents* themselves: which doth plainly shew that it ought not to be understood, as if it were spoken of [all] their *Children* (both godly and wicked) but of all those *Children* who do not degenerate from the steps of their *holy parents*; which sinne of *Apostacie*, (or *degeneration*) you cannot justly lay to the charge of *beleevers Infants*, who never sinned actually*: It is a sure truth, that the finnes of the *parents* being forgiven, the Lord will not impute the same unto their *Infants**. Originall sinne (I say) taketh no more hold on the *Infants*, then on their *parents*, and touching actual sinne, they are as cleare as their *parents**. But the like cannot be said of [all] their *children* of ripe yeares*.

Wherefore it plainly appeareth, that the *promise* is made generally to all the *infants* of the *faithfull*, howbeit not to all their *Children*, but onely to such as abide in the steps of their *righteous parents*, amongst which *holy children*, the *infants* of *beleeving parents* are not the smallest number.

Seeing then that the application of the *promise* of life and salvation, belongeth to the *infants* of *beleeving parents*, as really as to the *parents* themselves, or any other of their *children*. It is evident that they have right to *Baptisme*. Wherefore this text which you said, is to no purpose in the point, you may see to be of great weight concerning the point, and this will clearly appeare unto you (I hope) by that time you have weighed it well.

Consider, (I pray you) how that these converts upon the preaching.

* Mr. Spilsbury sayth, the word cōdemns none, but with respect to actual sinne. See his Treat. of Bapt. pag. 11. lin. 30.
* Sinne remitted, is not imputed, unless it be acted again.

* Exod. 10. 6.

* Ezck. 18. 10, 11, 12, 13.

preaching of Peter, were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and the other Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall wee doe? When the Apostle Peter saw that they were come thus far, he bid them repent, which doth not argue but that they repented before (for they were pricked in their hearts) but now Peter urged them to manifest their repentance, and sheweth them how they should by faith rest upon the promise of God, and he doth not limit it to [a] promise onely, but sayth [The] promise is to you and to your Children (namely,) the chiefest promise [a remedy answerable to their disease*.]

* Isa 61. 23.
Act. 2. ver. 23.

Ezek. 18. 10.
13.

* 1 Cor. 6. 9,
10, 11.
Rev. 21. 8.

* Rev. 2. 9.

* Isa. 4. 3.

* Pag. 8. 21,
22, 23, 24, &c.

A R. Pag. 1.
Pag. 2.

And though the promise was made unto them, and to their children, yet if any of their children were a whoremonger, or Idolater, or a Rayler, or a drunkard, or the like, the promise appertained not unto him. * Therefore by Children, he doth not here intend all their Children, both good and bad; for then impenitent persons and true Saints have share and share-like in the heavenly riches, which were blasphemie * so to affirme, that such Ismaelites, or Edomites, (though the seed of Abraham according to the flesh) should have right or interest to the promise or seale thereof; but as this promise is holy, so it appertaineth and is to be applyed only to those who ought to be judged holy persons, * in Covenant with God, having the righteousness of Jesus Christ imputed unto them: Now that the infants of beleeving parents are in Gods Covenant, and are made righteous by Jesus Christ is proved (in the answer * to your first part) and may further appear unto you by the former considerations, which I have here related: therefore let those premises there, and these here, be discreetly weighed, and then it will evidently appeare, that this promise mentioned (in Act. 2. 39.) appertaineth to the infants of beleeving parents, as well as to the parents themselves, though some of the Children of beleeving parents have no greater a share in this gracious promise than the infants of both unbelieving parents.

Your next words are these: In both these wee shall be satisfied if wee looke back into the former part of the Chapter, where when the gifts of the holy Ghost were given upon the 120. and they speaking in divers tongues, and the Jewes thereon, some marveiling, some mocking, and saying, they were full of new wine. Act. 2. 13. Peter hereupon stands up and speaks to the Jewes thus; The men are not drunke as yee suppose, but this is that which is spoken by the Prophet Joel; that in the last day, (sayth God) I will powre out my Spirit upon all flesh, &c.

fit upon all flesh, and your sons and daughters shall prophetic, &c. ver. 15, 16, 17. And immediately when he had thus spoken, he preached unto them Jesus Christ, whom they had murdered, and whom though dead and buried, yet God had raised up, and who being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of his Father the promise of the holy Ghost, had shed forth this which they did see and heare, ver. 33. As if Peter should have sayd to the Jewes thus; Wee are not filled with Wine as yee suppose, but are filled with the Spirit, promised to our fathers long since, that should be poured forth in these our dayes, and that their sonnes and their daughters should prophetic, which is now fulfilled upon us their sonnes and daughters, and may be also poured out upon you, and your Children, to make you all prophetic and speake with tongues as we doe: for you and your Children are all the sonnes and daughters of the Jewes, &c.

I answer. All which you have sayd here, is able to give no satisfaction, concerning the matter in hand; for as much as (though you have cited some verses which you thought would make for your advantage) yet you have omitted, ver. 21. which is most materiall and pertinent to our present purpose. Moreover, you have not done well in taking upon you to be the Apostle Peters spokesman (or interpreter of his meaning) before you had minded his speech better, then it appeareth you have done; for we reade not that the Apostle Peter told them, that they and their Children should (or might) all prophetic, and speake with tongues (as he and some others did) much lesse doth he yeeld such a faim'd reason (to wit) because they were the sonnes and daughters of the Jewes, &c. as you would import he did; which doth not found according to truth. But this indeed you ought to have minded that (in the Text alledged) there is something else of greater weight and consequence, then the bare prophetic or speaking with tongues, for whereas the Apostle saith, [The] promise [he] speaketh of that which is generall to every believer, both young and old. The truth of this appeareth from the expresse words of the holy Ghost. Act. 2. 39. The promise is to [you] and to [your Children] and to [all] that are afar off [even as many as the Lord our God shall call.] But to speak with tongues and prophetic, is not common to every believer. Therefore this promise (which appertaineth generally to [all] saints) is something else then the bare prophetic or speaking with tongues. Wee know that God can make open wicked men to prophetic, and the Beasts of the field to speake with tongues, without giving them any promise of Eternall life [as may appear.

*See Act. 2. 39. compared with ver. 21.

* Numb. 22.
 & 23. & 24.
 & 31. 8.
 * Jude 11.
 Rev. 2. 14.
 * Joel. 2. 28.

peare unto you by the storie of *Balaam* and his *asse* *] whom wee must not therefore ranke with the *sonnes* and *daughters* * (mentioned in *Joel* *) or with the holy *Children* (mentioned in *Act. 2. 39.*) for then by the same *Rule*, false *Prophets*, and *unreasonable creatures* must be *baptized*; which to think would be very absurd. Wherefore it evidently appeareth, that this *promise* is a *promise* of something else then a bare *prophecyng*, or *speaking with tongues*.

a Joh. 3. 36.
 b Joh. 6. 35.
 51. 54.
 57. 58
 Joh. 10. 28, 29.
 c 1 Cor. 12. 28,
 29, 30.
 d See Gen. 3.
 compared with
 Cap. 4. 16.
 & Cap. 5.
 e Gen. 17. 7.
 f Act. 2. 21.
 g Ver. 39.
 h Luk. 10. 17,
 18, 19, 20.

Consider (I pray you) that *Eternall life* is that which appertaineth to *beleevers* onely^a, and is distributed to every one of them^b, but so is not *Prophecyng*, or *speaking with tongues*^c. This *promise* of *Eternall life* was made to *Adam*, and all the members of Gods *visible Church* then^d, and established with *Abraham* and his seed in their *Generations*^e; and this heavenly and *Evangelicall promise*, is here repeated by *Peter*^f, and applied to all *beleevers* and their seed^g.

And though wee should be furnished with the externall gifts of the *holy Ghost*; and evidently perceive the *devills* to be subject unto us, through the name of *Christ*, and see *Sathan* fall downe as lightning from heaven; at the sight whereof we might have cause to rejoyce; yet wee have more cause of joy, that our names are written in the *Lambs book of life*^h.

This *eternall life*, is a *life* above all *lives*, and to be desired above all things in the world, and the *promise* of this *eternall life*, *Peter* applyeth to *beleeving men* and *women* and their *holy seed*. And though in the same *promise* is included divers things, which God distributeth unto some of his *Saints*, and not to other some, yet the chief thing promised is *life* and *salvation* through *Iesus Christ* (whereunto all *Saints* are partakers) without which all the *prophecies* and *tongues* in the world will availe us nothing.

i 1 Cor. 7. 14.
 k Jer. 1. 5.
 l Luke 1. 15.
 m 2 Pet. 1. 1.
 n Rev. 22. 14.
 o Cor. 12. 12,
 13.
 Eph. 2. 13.
 & 3. 6. 8.
 Rom 10. 13.
 p Pag. 1. lin. 24.

And though the *infants* of *beleevers* be not capable to *prophecy* or *speake with tongues*, yet I doubt not but they are *holy*ⁱ. *Jeremiah* and *John Baptist*, were sanctified by the *holy Spirit* [in the wombe] and seeing that *beleevers* have the like *precious faith*^m, they have also the like *precious priviledges*ⁿ.

Whereas you say, ° So then by this time wee may see what is meant by the *promise* (to wit) the gift of the *holy Ghost*.

I answer; It cannot appeare any thing at all the more for thy *your exposition*, neither doth it yet appeare that you understand the meaning of the *holy Ghost* in this place; for if you did, I think you could distinguish between the externall gifts of the *holy Ghost*.

and the promise of eternal life. Consider therefore how that Petre's application of the promise is a reason which he yeeldeth of his former speech; and so sayth he) *shall reign with him for ever and ever* [which he saith] (or because) *the promise is true* and so he saith *children of God* what promise is that? Even the promise of salvation and redemption spoken of in *Joel 2. 32.* And it shall come to passe, that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be delivered: for in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem shall be delivered, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call. Compare with this the words of *Rom. 10. 13.* And it will evidently appear, that the promise (spoken of in *Act. 2. 39.*) is the promise of salvation. *Joel* sayth, *And it shall come to passe, that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be delivered.* And *Peter* rehearsing this promise sayth, (*Act. 2. 39.*) *And it shall come to passe, that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved.* *Joel* (in application of the promise) sayth, *For in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call.* *Prophet* (in application of the promise) sayth, (to those converts which were pricked in their hearts, and asked counsel of the Apostles what they should doe) *The promise* (sayth he) *is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* I beseech you, weigh the Sentences; He doth not say, *Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall prophesie and speak with tongues.* This is not [the] medicine which was applied to heale the wounded broken hearted soules converted at his Sermons. But he speaketh of that which is of a higher nature, he applyeth a more effectual and speciall medicine unto them; a more singular cordiall: *Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.* And this is that which the Apostle *Paul* so much insisteth upon, *Rom. 10.* where in the relation, interpretation, application, and prosecution of (his text in) *Deut. 32. 12, 13, 14.* he sheweth wherein the weight of the Saints glory and happiness consisteth, *Rom. 10. ver. 6.* *The righteousness of faith* (sayth he) *saith on this wise.* Say not in thine heart, *Who shall ascend into heaven?* that is, to bring [Christ downe] from above: ver. 7. Or who shall descend into the deepe? (that is,) to bring [up Christ] againe from the dead: ver. 8. But what sayth it? The word is nigh thee even in thy mouth, and in thine heart, (that is) the word of faith which wee preach: ver. 9. That if thou shalt confesse

* Joel 2. 32.

Act. 2. 39.

Rom. 10. 13.

Rom. 10. ver. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

1 Pet. 2. 6, 7.
Isa. 28. 16.

with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be [saved:] ver. 10. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth Confession is made unto [salvation:] ver. 11. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him [shall not be ashamed:] ver. 12. For there is no difference between the Jew, and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is [rich] unto all that call upon him. And in ver. 13. he sheweth further wherein this riches consisteth; For (sayth he) whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

In consideration of these things, we may safely conclude; that the promise mentioned in Act. 2. 39. is the same promise mentioned in Joel 2. 32. & Act. 2. 21. & Rom. 10. 13. Even the promise of eternall life and salvation by Jesus Christ our Lord.

a Gen. 17. 11.
b Rom. 4. 11.

But peradventure it will seeme strange unto some, that the infants of believers should be thought to be in the state of salvation, or to have the righteousness of faith, or to be confessors of Jesus Christ, or believers, or invocators of his name, considering that they cannot manifest the same actually in their own persons. But wee ought to note, that all these things are theirs by imputation; it is imputed unto them as if they had done the same in their own persons. Wherefore the Lord gave them the signe and seale of the righteousness of faith, which doth really demonstrate unto us, that the infants of believers, have the righteousness of faith imputatively; otherwise the Lord would not have given them such a signe, whereby to distinguish them from those who were not in Covenant with him, and had not this righteousness upon them. And touching their confession of Christ, all the Jewes infants, as they grew up to be capable, were to confesse Christ; according to this saying of the righteousness of faith, which spake on this wise; Say not, who shall ascend into heaven, to bring Christ downe from above, &c. And seeing God usually giveth names unto persons according to their nature, state, and condition, the infants of the believing Jewes having the name of Jewes rightly attributed unto them, they were Jewes (that is, Confessors) though they could not actually confesse: and the like may be sayd for their invocation (or calling upon the name of God;) So it appeareth that the infants of the Jewes had such a holy state and condition upon them, that the visible imputation of holy actions, was conferred upon them, though they could not act the same. And the very like may be said concerning the infants of believing parents now; And

c Heb. 7. 9, 10.

seeing

seeing that *salvation* appertaineth to the *infants* of *beleevers*, the *righteousnes* of *faith* is imputed unto them; and therefore they ought to receive the *signe* and *scale* of the same *righteousnes*; for we are to account that *Iesus Christ* (our *righteousnes*) is a *Saviour* [in a *speciall* manner] unto all those who ought to be judged *righteous* persons in *Covenant* with him; and ought not to be accounted to have the *guilt* of *originall sinne*, but that they have it *pardoned* and *done away* through him.

But the *infants* of *beleeving* parents ought to be judged *righteous* persons in *Covenant* with *Christ*, and ought not to be esteemed to have the *guilt* of *originall sinne*; but that they have it *pardoned*, and *done away* through him, (as hath been proved before.)

Therefore wee are to account that *Iesus Christ* (our *righteousnes*) is a *Saviour* unto them in a *speciall* manner, as well as to their parents.

It is certaine, that the rarest Saint in the world, though he professe and confesse never so much, yet he (being one of Adams posteritie) hath *originall sinne* from the houre of his birth, to the time of his death, yea and before his birth, he was conceived in sinne; So David sayth of himselfe, *Loe in iniquitie, (was I painfully brought forth) and in sin my mother conceived me, Psal. 51.5.* But herein consisteth the *Saints* happines, that all their *sinnes* are remitted through *Iesus Christ*; so that the Lord will not remember their *sins*, nor impute the same unto them; he counteth them not *guiltie*; he saveth his people from their *sinnes*; therefore is he called *Iesus*; So David sayth, that with *Iehovah* is bountifull mercy, and plentifull redemption. And he will redeem *Israel* out of all his *iniquities*, *Psal. 130.7,8.* Now whereas it is said, *He shall save [his people] from their sinnes; He will redeem [Israel] out of [all] his iniquities.* Hereby is meant, all the *sinnes* of all his people (in *Covenant* with him) both young and old, both great and small. So David sayth, *Psal. 115.12,13,14,15.* The Lord hath been mindfull, of us, he will blesse us, he will blesse the house of *Israel*: He will blesse the house of *Aaron*: He will blesse them that feare the Lord; both small and great. The Lord shall increase you more and more, you and your children. You are blessed of the Lord, which hath made Heaven and Earth. And so (in *Isa. 44.3.*) the Lord sayth to *Israel*, I will poure my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring. And (in *Isa. 45.25.*) In the Lord shall [all] the seed of *Israel* be justified, and shall glory. By [all] the seed of *Israel*, he doth

f Luk. 18. 15,
16, 17.

g Mar. 16. 16.

h Mar. 16. 16.

i Mar. 16. 16.

k Mar. 16. 16.

l Mar. 16. 16.

m Mar. 16. 16.

n Mar. 16. 16.

o Mar. 16. 16.

p Mar. 16. 16.

q Mar. 16. 16.

r Mar. 16. 16.

s Mar. 16. 16.

t Mar. 16. 16.

u Mar. 16. 16.

v Mar. 16. 16.

w Mar. 16. 16.

x Mar. 16. 16.

y Mar. 16. 16.

z Mar. 16. 16.

aa Mar. 16. 16.

ab Mar. 16. 16.

ac Mar. 16. 16.

ad Mar. 16. 16.

ae Mar. 16. 16.

af Mar. 16. 16.

ag Mar. 16. 16.

ah Mar. 16. 16.

ai Mar. 16. 16.

aj Mar. 16. 16.

ak Mar. 16. 16.

al Mar. 16. 16.

am Mar. 16. 16.

an Mar. 16. 16.

ao Mar. 16. 16.

ap Mar. 16. 16.

aq Mar. 16. 16.

ar Mar. 16. 16.

as Mar. 16. 16.

at Mar. 16. 16.

au Mar. 16. 16.

av Mar. 16. 16.

aw Mar. 16. 16.

ax Mar. 16. 16.

ay Mar. 16. 16.

az Mar. 16. 16.

ba Mar. 16. 16.

bb Mar. 16. 16.

bc Mar. 16. 16.

bd Mar. 16. 16.

be Mar. 16. 16.

bf Mar. 16. 16.

bg Mar. 16. 16.

bh Mar. 16. 16.

bi Mar. 16. 16.

bj Mar. 16. 16.

bk Mar. 16. 16.

bl Mar. 16. 16.

k Rom. 9. 8.

l Joh. 15. 4, 5.
6. 10.

m Jer. 30. 20.

a Rom. 10. 12.

b Gal. 3. 28.

c Rom. 4. 8.

d Isa. 53. 11.

e 1 Joh. 3. 5, 6.

f Isa. 46. 10.

g Gen. 17. 10.

h Psal. 100.

i Exod. 12. 48.

k Rom. 1. 12.

15, 16.

17. 20, 23, 24.

l Heb. 13. 8.

m Rom. 10. 12.

n Rom. 5. 12.

13, 14. & c.

o Ver. 20. 21.

p Psal. 115. 13.

q Isa. 65. 23.

r Jer. 1.

s Psal. 22. 10, 11.

& 71. 6, 17, 18.

t Mar. 10. 13, 14.

15, 16.

u Rev. 14. 13.

v Psal. 100. 5.

w 2 Sam. 12. 23.

x Psal. 80. 1, 10.

not mean *Apostates*, for they are not counted for the seed^a; but this justification, and glorification, is promised onely to those that abide in the Lord Jesus^b; and so continue in his Church; But the seed of the faithfull [in their infancie] cannot justly be sayd to depart from Christ, to aberate from his Commandements; to Apostate or degenerate from that heavenly state, wherein the Lord of his mercy hath planted them; therefore they are (as well in infancie as after) to be accounted holy, [spirituall], and in the new Covenant, in the very promise of Eternall life, and freed from the wrath of God and curses of the law, and under grace and mercy through Jesus Christ our Lord; therefore it is apparent; that the Lord imputeth them righteous through him; so then they are righteous by imputation; they are believers and Confessors imputatively, yea, and all the graces of God are theirs by imputation; and this favour and benediction, is not onely extended to the infants of the believing Jewes^m, but also to the infants of the believing Gentiles; There is [no difference^a] (sayth the Apostle Paul) then riches are equal, they are all one in Christ^b; God is their God, and Christ is their Saviour in a speciall manner; He justifieth the circumcision and uncircumcision by his righteousness; This righteous servant justifieth many^a; He pardoneth the iniquities of all that abide in his Covenant. And seeing that the believing Jewes, and the believing Gentiles, have equal priviledges; As the infants of the believing Jewes were, and are in the Covenant of God with their parents; so are the infants of believing Gentiles; for, Jesus Christ is the same to day as he was yesterday, and so is he forever. God is the same God over all, and therefore rich unto all that call upon him. And seeing he is the same God, rich unto all that call upon him. Believing Gentiles have the same priviledges for their seed, as the believing Jewes had and have for their seed; so that though their infants are all sinners^a originally, yet by the free grace of God they are justified; their transgression is forgiven; and their sinnes covered, and therefore they are all blessed both now and hereafter; buds and blossoms. Blessed in their conception; blessed in their birth, blessed in their life, and blessed at their death; remaining still in the Covenant, branches of Gods holy Vine. In the Lord shall all this blessed seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory. Note, he doth not limit it to [some Toney], but extendeth it to [all] Inot one person of them is exempted; for, though they be all sinners by nature, yet by grace they are saved, not of themselves.

selves; but it is the gift of God, who hath said, as he liveth, that he ~~doeth not the duty of a father; neither shall the sonne die for the fathers~~ iniquities; but every one shall beare his own iniquitie. Shall every one beare his owne iniquitie? Then the iniquitie of the righteous parents (that is remitted) is not visibly imputed to any of their children, [in their infancie.] Therefore those infants are to be accounted righteous; For the mercy of Jehovah is from everlasting to everlasting, upon them that feare him; and his righteousness unto childrens children, to such as keep his Covenant, &c. Psal. 103. 17, 18.

For to say, that the sinne of the parent that is remitted, is imputed to his childe, [that never sinned actually,] is an arguing that the sonne shall die for the father; yea, and for the sinnes of the righteous father. A flat contradiction both of the Scripture, and Reason it selfe.

But it may be some will say, that the best beleivers on earth doe sin daily; yea and that in their best actions; Shall all these sinnes be remitted, and not be imputed, considering, that sinne is daily committed by them?

Ans. If they sinned, they have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and through him, the beleiving parents, who die daily unto sinne; have their sinnes so quelled, and crushed, that there is no power in the same whereby to condemne them; for as the Brazen Serpent was lifted up in the Wildernes, so is Jesus Christ lifted up for them; so that the fiery Messengers of Sathan, though they sting them, yet cannot destroy their soules; and this being remitted to the parents, & to all beleivers, shall not be imputed to them; because still upon the renewing of sinne, they renew their repentance, and so doe cut the cords of sinne, by godly sorrow; But a wicked person that is not penitent, hath the iniquities of his [fathers] imputed unto him; and his mothers sinne is not blotted out; all this is remembered with the Lord continually, and laid upon the sinner that is not justified by Jesus Christ; But the infants of beleivers (as hath been observed before) are from under the guilt of originall sinne; their parents sinne is not imputed unto them; but both the originall sinne and actuall sinne is fully remitted; and the infants cannot be taxed with actuall sinne; they are cleare, they never acted sinne. Wherefore by all this it appeareth that the Lord spake not in vaine, when he bid the parents, choose life, that both they and their seed might live; for though God visiteth the iniquities of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation of those that hate him, yet he sheweth mercy to thousands of those that love him and keep his Commandments.

q Ezek. 18.

r 1 Ioh. 2. 1, 2.

f Ioh. 3. 14, 15.

r 2 Cor 7. 19.

u Psal. 109 14.

* Exod. 20. 5, 6

Seeing then it is so apparent that the *infants of believers* are freely justified and saved by *Jesus Christ* through his righteousness, they are under this *promise* mentioned by *Peter*, *Act. 2. 39.* And therefore are to have *Baptisme* (the *seale* of the same *promise*) administered upon them. And this conclusion is agreeable to your own position, * (which is,) that that which availeth to justification, doth (according to the rule) availe to *Baptisme*, &c.

Whereas you further say *, that by *children* are meant *sonnes and daughters*, which [should] prophesie. This I denie not; But that it is onely meant of them, I doe deny; for, *all are not Prophets* *. *Jeremia* was not a *Prophet* till *God* called him. And though he was not set about the work, till he was capable to understand, and apprehend *, yet he was sanctified in the wombe, and therefore the *promise* appertained unto him then, before he could prophesie; even so the *promise* is really made to the *infants* of the *faithfull*, though they can neither prophesie, nor speake with tongues. Wherefore it appeareth (by what hath been said in answer unto you) that your argument is quite overthrowne, and the drift thereof hath no weight in it to edifie the soule, nor any strength to prove what you undertooke *, (namely) that by *children*, no *infants* are meant in this place of *Acts 2. 39.*

And although it be said, that the *promise* is to their *children*, yet you deny that the *Text* speaketh of their *children* in *Covenant* *, by saying, that this objection (that these *children* were in *Covenant*) hath no colour of footing in the *Text*; for proote whereof you bring your own former speeches *, and adde for further demonstration, saying *, that first the *promise* is made equally to them, and to their *children*, and to them that are afar off. But these which are afar off, are not within the *Covenant* by the *promise* untill they beleeve the same.

To which I answer; that if it be not meant of their *children* in *Covenant*, then is it meant of their *children* out of *Covenant*! But you should know, that those who are out of *Covenant*, are not within the *promise* of life and salvation! None have right unto the tree of Life, but those that are in *Covenant* with *God* *, and those that abide not in *Christ*, they have no part in him or his *. But the *infants* of *believers* are in *Christ*, and in the *promise*; and *God* is faithfull *, and therefore will not breake his *promise* with those whom he hath effectually called to the fellowship of his Sonne *Jesus Christ*.

And it appeareth by the *Apostle Peters* words, that these *children*

* A. R. second
part, pag. 6. lin.
37, 38, 39.
* Pag. 2. lin. 40.

* 1 Cor. 12. 29

* Jer. 1. 6. 10,
11, 12, 17,
18.

* Pag. 2. lin. 21.

* Line 41.

* Line 42.

* Pag. 3. lin. 1.
2, 3, 4, 5.

* 2 Rev. 21. 7, 8.

* & 22. 14, 15.

* Ioh. 15. 6.

* 1 Thes. 5. 24.

children (mentioned in *Act. 2. 39.*) were such whom in visibilitie the Lord had so called in Christ Jesus; for the Apostle speaketh of them in the time present, *The promise [is] to you* (sayth he) *and to your children* : but when he speaketh of those afar off, he hath relation wholly to the future time, saying, *and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God [shall] call.* And so by this he shewed that God would be a God unto all those whom he so calleth.

Now this calling, I doe not understand to be a bare publication of the Gospel, or generall invitation, which appertaineth unto all^b; but such a calling which is appropriated unto those whom the Lord accepteth in the Covenant of the Gospel, and fellowship with his Sonne Jesus Christ. That the infants of beleevers have fellowship with Jesus Christ, is evident; *Suffer them, sayth Christ, to come unto mee, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdome of heaven^c.* Seeing then that they are declared to be in Jesus Christ, who is made a^d Covenant to the people; they are not out of Covenant, no more then the infants of Abraham, to whom the Lord spake, saying, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, &c. Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations^e.*

By all this it appeareth, that wee have no ground to deny that the Scripture speaketh of their children in Covenant, neither are we to dreame that the promise appertaineth to all sorts, or is visibly made equally to visible beleevers, and visible unbelievers also; for though in Gods secret account, visible unbelievers may be accounted as visible beleevers are, and have the promise reserved for them by God in the secret intention and unalterable resolution of his sacred Majestie, who will afterward manifest it visibly to appertaine unto them in his appointed time; yet (these unbelievers) the meanwhile [in our account, and in their own account,] are not to be esteemed heires of the promise, or elect vessels of mercy, so long as they are not in the Covenant; for none are to be esteemed as the children of life, but those that are visibly in Jesus Christ; for whose sake life is promised to those that choose life, and also to their seed^f.

Secondly (you say) *If they were in the Covenant, by having this promise made to them, then were they of the new Covenant and Church of the Gospel, for there were no other people to be accounted in Covenant with God, save those which be of this Church, but those were not of this Church, but they were afterwards added therunto, (as appears ver. 41.)*

and

^b Mar. 15. 15.
² Tim. 1. 9.

^c Luk. 18. 15,
16, 17.
Alsa. 42, 6, 7.

^e Gen. 17. 10.

^f Deut. 29. 2.

Page 3. line 6.

and therefore were not of it before, and consequently notwithstanding the promise, being so to them and their children, yet neither they nor their children were of the Covenant nor Church, untill they did believe, although they were Jewes, and so the children of faithfull Abraham.

Ans. Here, I think, you are mistaken, for you would inferre that these were not in the new Covenant, before they were baptized and added to the particular Church; but then by the same rule, wee may think, that the Apostles baptized and admitted into Church-fellowship, those who were out of the new Covenant, and that those Converts (mentioned in *Act. 2. 39.*) were out of the new Covenant, when they had gladly received the Word, for as touching their Baptisme, and addition to the Church, the Scripture deposeth the same, as distinct from the rest which went before. But you should know, that none ought to be baptized before they are in Covenant with God; Wherefore if these aforesaid, were not in Covenant with God, before they were baptized and added, as aforesaid, then they were first added, and were afterward baptized, and afterward entered into Covenant with God, which disorderly proceeding is not according to the Rule of Jesus Christ.

Moreover, If it be admitted, that persons must be first added to the particular Church, before they are to be baptized (which thing I dare not affirm.) But suppose it were so, yet (I say) it cannot be proved that persons are not in the new Covenant, till they are joyned to the particular Church, for all those that are out of the new Covenant, are not fit matter for it. But that these Converts (mentioned in *Act. 2.*) were in the new Covenant before they were baptized, is apparent by their conversion and repentance; and that the blessed promise of God in the free pardon of their sinnes, was rightly applyed unto them, and their seed, and this is the new Covenant. That God will be our God, and wee shall be his people, and that he will be mercifull unto us, in forgiving us all our iniquities, *Heb. 8. 10, 11, 12.* And so David sayeth, O blessed is he whose transgression is pardoned, and whose sinne is covered. O blessed is the man, whom the Lord imputeth not sinne *. And Paul explaineth it to be Righteousnesse imputed [without workes] *Rom. 4. 6.* And that the righteousness of faith is visibly imputed to the infants of believers (as hath been heretofore) is cleare from *Act. 2. 39.* compared with other Scriptures, and therefore I conclude, they are believers imputatively, and in the new Covenant, and ought to be baptized.

See *Gen. 17. 7.*
Rev. 21. 3.

* *Psal. 32. 1, 2.*

Now that persons are in the *promise* or *new Covenant* visibly before they have *faith*, I suppose, no well informed *Christian* will affirm. But to say, that *true visible believers*, though unbaptized, are not in the *new Covenant*, till they be baptized and added, as before specified, it sheweth a great deal of ignorance, (at the best) in him that so affirmeth.

NExt, you say, *Their second Argument is from those places which speake of baptizing whole households.*

To which I answer. It is certaine that divers places of *Scripture* speake of baptizing whole households. And it would argue weaknes and presumption in us to affirm, that there were no infants in those families, except wee could prove the same; which if there were none, it maketh nothing against the baptizing of infants. I hope we are not ignorant (at least wee are admonished not to be ignorant) that God baptized the children of Israel in the Sea; in which act he really declared who are the right subjects of Baptisme, namely, *Believing parents*, and their infants with them, *Jewes* and *Proselytes*; such as were the right subjects of *Circumcision**: And if wee doe discreetly weigh the great and generall Commission of *Iesus Christ* given when he ascended upon high) it will give great light to this point; for it declareth that all Nations were commanded to be made Disciples and those that were made Disciples of Christ, he commanded to be baptized, so soone as it appeared that the Application of the Gospel appertained unto them; *Goe*, (sayth Christ) *teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* *Goe yee into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned**. Now I hope you will not denie infants to be part of the Nations, or to be part of the number of Creatures spoken of here, for whom an immortall state is prepared; for it is a sure truth, that they are reasonable creatures, and comprehended in these words [Every Creature.] Consider then how that the purest infants of the holiest parents are by nature the children of wrath, Conceived in sinne, and brought forth in iniquitie, and have Originall sinne cleaving unto them till their change come, (I mean, till the time of their death or dissolution) and are by nature enemies against God, so deeply stained with sinne, that nothing in the world is effectually to cleanse them therefrom*, but the crimson blood of their crucified Saviour; naturall corruption from their conception, is in-

C

herent

1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.

* Gen. 7. 9. 14.
Exod. 12. 48.
49.

* Mat. 28. 18.

* Mar. 16. 15,
16.* Psal. 49. 7, 8.
Rev. 1. 5. 9.

* Mr. Spilsbury sayth, that the Word of God shews that he hath elected persons to the means as well as to the end, being the way unto the same. And that was the Adoption of sonnes; and to be called & justified by believing in Iesus Christ. See his Treatise of Bap. pag. 3. lin. 43, 42, 43, 44.

* Psal. 68. 18.

Gen. 17.

Exod. 12. 48.

* Gen. 12. 3.

Gal. 3. 8, 9.

herent in them, and cannot be subdued but by the free grace of God. Now to say, that God hath not ordained sufficient means * for their recovery, is in effect to cast them all downe to hell, and so to huddle the eyes of Charitie, (and so to place them with dogges and whoremongers without) or else to judge they are saved without the means, and that they so enter into the kingdome of heaven, even without Christ ! without faith ! without holines ! yea without regeneration ! which to affirme is contrary unto the Scripture; for Christ Iesus is the onely way, and doore of enterance to God the Father. He is the ladder of life, by which all the Saints must ascend unto their mansion-houses. Christ is the onely light, who giveth light unto all that abide in him. Who being the brightness of his Fathers glory, and the expresse Image of his person, freely distributeth those gifts which he hath freely received of his Father, and doth not in the least lessen the Saints priviledges, but in his rich mercy bestoweth his rich gifts upon his Saints for their good and benefit, though by nature they are rebellious unto him. Thou hast (sayth David) received gifts for men; yea for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell amongst them * : for as much then as the Lord Iesus hath received gifts for the rebellious, that God might dwell amongst them, and that the infants of believers are rebellious by nature; Surely God never ordained (though they die in their infancie) that they should be saved without the gifts there spoken of, which are necessary for them, and therefore we must confesse, that they are the creatures, comprehended in the generall Commission, given by Iesus Christ, when he ascended up on high, when he said, Go teach all nations, baptizing them, &c. Go preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, &c. Hereby is meant that the generall offer of the Gospel should be tendered to all, and that those rebellious persons who were content to subject themselves unto the yoke of Iesus Christ, should have the Gospel applyed unto them, and also the seale of the Covenant thereof; and so all believing parents; and their infants, though rebellious by nature, should all receive the same precious priviledges and prerogatives, as were granted to Abraham and his infants, in whom the Lord did Evangelically declare that all the families of the earth should be blessed *; and to this Christ Iesus alluded when he applyed the Gospel to Zacharys familie, house, or household, saying, This day is salvation come to this house, for so much as he also is the sonne of Abraham : For the Sonne of man is come to seeke and to save that

that which was lost *. And this was written for our sakes *, To the intent that wee should know that every beleever is the childe of Abraham *. & that every beleeving parent hath the same precious privileges, as Isaac had *, and his Infants the same precious privileges, as Isaacs infants had *, who though they were by nature the Children of wrath, yet by grace they were the Children of God, in his Covenant *, and in his Church *, Children of the promise, counted for the seed *, and called by his name.

Whereas you say, because there may be infants in the household, that thence they conclude, that infants may be baptized,

I ans. I never did heare any so conclude, from this bare argument (or may be) which you have here specified.

But to this argument you make answer, that there might be no infants there,

To which I reply, that there might be infants there; for who should controule (or forbid) the parents from keeping their owne Children, as well in infancie, as after ?

Whereas you say, your Negative is as good as their Affirmative; What affirmative dot you mean? and who are the persons you here intend? If you meane the bare conclusion from infants being in the household, that therefore infants may be baptized; I think such an Affirmative is somewhat like your Negative, though it be not the same; but peradventure those [some others] you mention besides Separates, were the authors hereof.

But to make your Negative as good, [and more probable] then their Affirmative, which you say is without any prooffe, you adde these words, For it is said, Act. 18. 8. That Crispus the chiefe Ruler of the Synagogue beleeved on the Lord, with all his household, and that many of the Corinthians hearing it, beleeved and were baptized. And it is said of the Gaoler, who was baptized and all his, Act. 16. 32. That Paul and Syllas first preached the Word unto him, and to all that were in his house. And in the 33. verse, it is said, that he with all his household beleeved in God. So then (say you) it is plaine, that they first beleeved, and then were baptized; and although it be barely spoken of Pauls baptizing the household of Stephanus, 1 Cor. 1. 16. And of the baptizing of Lydia and her household, Act. 16. 15. yet it cannot reasonably be imagined, but that he did baptize these according to the Commission, and as he did baptize the Gaoler and his house, which was first preaching to them, and bringing him and all his house to the faith, as is evident by the Text;

* Luk. 19, 9, 10.

* Rom. 4. 23,

24.

* Gal. 3. 7.

* Gen. 17.

Isa. 56.

* Isa. 22. 23, 24

Psal. 112. 1, 2.

* Gen. 17. 7.

* Exod. 12. 48.

* Rom. 9. 8.

Gen. 21. 12.

and those other places which are more silent, must be expounded and understood by this which is more plaine, and not this by those.

To which I answer, that all this which you have here rehearsed, doth not prove the thing for which you brought it (to wit) that your Negative is as good and more probable then their Affirmative. I pray you, tell me, Doth any of these Scriptures tell you that there was no Infants in these families? or that (according to your former Conclusion) it is more probable, *there was none, then that there was any*? Surely such a thing cannot be gathered from any tittle of Scripture, or necessary consequence therefrom; neither doe these Scriptures, alledged by you, nor your following Conclusion from thence, which you have here set downe, contradict the Baptisme of Infants in the least, wherefore it will not serve your turne, to vindicate what you have said before in opposition of the truth.

That which we ought seriously to minde, is that the infants of believing parents, are blessed with their faithfull parents*. Their iniquities are forgiven, and their sinnes are covered*, and the Lord imputeth righteousness unto them [without workes*] (as hath been proved before*). Wherefore wee may safely conclude, that all those infants which were then in these families, or any other (if they were the infants of one or both believing parents) the application of the Gospel belonged unto them, and therefore the Apostles in preaching life and salvation (and applying the promises) unto the parents, did also apply the promises unto their infants; according to the practice of God himselfe, who did not visibly separate between the believing parents and their infants, but graciously accepted of them in his Covenant; And when he preached the Gospel to the parents, never did exclude, but ever did include their infants with them. And to the intent that all believing parents might be encouraged to trust in him and relie upon him for the accomplishment of his gracious promises, which he made unto them and their Infants. The holy and blessed God repeated the same divers times, yea, and sundry times, in one and the same instance; as in Gen. 17, *I will* (sayth God to Abraham) *make my Covenant between me and thee, and thou shalt be a father of a multitude of Nations, &c.* And *I will* establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting Covenant. To be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, and (againe he sayth) *I will be their God.* Note here how often in this one place and at this one time, he repeateth

* Isa. 64. 13.

* Psal. 32. 1, 2.

* Rom. 4. 6.

* See pag. 3. 4. 6.

co pag. 34.

See pag. 15, 16,

37.

* Gen. 17. 2, 3,

4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

See also ver.

19. 11.

eth his *Covenant*, hereby to take away all doubts and suspicious objections, (which might happen (through Sathans temptations) to arise in the hearts of any of his people, against the large extent and sufficiency of the same *Covenant*.) he bindeth it up with weighty words, and sentences of great consequence; yea and for further confirmation of his peoples faith (in believing the firmness of his promises, and the largeness of his *Covenant*) he annexed a visible sign and seale thereof, to the intent that they might not forget his *Covenant*: And as believing Gentiles and their infants were taken into *Covenant* with God then, so they were to submit unto his ordinances, amongst which this same Circumcision (the sign of his *Covenant* * and seale of the righteousness of faith*) was one, which was given unto them to observe throughout their generations: for this see *Gen.* 17. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. And in *Exod.* 12. 48 49. The Lord there declareth unto his people *Israel*, saying; And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the Passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it, and he shall be as one that is borne in the Land; for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof. One law shall be to him that is home-borne, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you. By this wee may see, that the Proselytes and their seed, had equall precious priviledges with the Jewes, and their seed. And so the Jewes infants and the infants of believing Gentiles then were not as those who were without God in the world, but were joynt-heires of the same precious promises, they had visible right, by vertue of the *Covenant*, to all the ordinances of God, then present, or now to come, and were to be partakers thereof, as they had capacitie to receive the same, even according to the requiring of the *Scripture*. There is much then to be considered in this, that the infants of believers were admitted to be members of the visible Church (and to receive the sign and seale of the righteousness of faith, together with other priviledges) before Christ was manifested in the flesh; for Jesus Christ came not to take any priviledges from them, but gave them as great (if not greater) in stead thereof. Let us not thinke that he came into the world to take from them the types, and to bereave them both of substances and types; But rather let us conclude, that for as much as the Sonne of God (whose delight was with the sonnes of men *, before he was made the sonne of man) is wisdom and truth it selfe, he came not to deceive the least members of his beloved Spouse, of the least happi-

* *Gen.* 17. 11.* *Rom.* 4. 11.* *Prov.* 8. 31.

* Gen. 17. 11.
Rom. 4. 11.

nes or blessednesse, which they formerly by right received and enjoyed from him. Now it was a *blessednesse* unto Gods people for the Lord to give unto them *outward visible signes*, for the confirmation of their faith. But *Circumcision of Infants*, was an outward visible *signe* given unto his people from God, for the confirmation of their faith *: Therefore it was a *blessednesse* unto them to enjoy it, amongst other blessings, and blessed priviledges.

11. 11. 11. 11.

It being then a *blessednes* for the infants of *believers* to be admitted members of Gods *visible Church*, and so to have (by vertue of his Covenant) a visible right to all Gods *ordinances*, and to partake of them, according as they were capable (I mean in respect of a naturall capabilitie) if the same *priviledges* are not granted (by God) to the generation of the *faithfull* now, it seemeth that God *unloaderth* his people of the *blessings* which he hath formerly bestowed upon them, which to affirme is contrary to the Scripture, *Psal. 68. 19.* where David speaking of the gifts which Christ should give unto the *Rebellious*, sayth, *Blessed be the Lord, who daily loaderth us with blessings, even the God of our salvation, Selah.* Seeing then that it was such a *blessednesse* for the *believing parents*, to have their infants in Gods Covenant with themselves, and to receive the *signe* thereof, for confirmation of their faith, and seeing that God daily loadeth his people with *blessings*, then surely it cannot reasonably be imagined that God hath unloaded his people of these excellent *blessings*, for as much as he is alwayes one and the same. Seeing then that *believing Jews* and *Gentiles*, and their infants joyntly, had this *blessednes*, they have the same *blessednes* now; their *priviledges* are not lessened by the coming of Christ; for he came not for any such intent and purpose, but he came to confirm the promises made with the fathers: therefore was *Iesus Christ* a Minister of the *Circumcision* for the truth of God, and so to confirme the promises made with the fathers *, by fulfilling them; So all the promises in him are yea and amen. And this was done also, that the *Gentiles* might glorifie God for his *merci*; as it is written, *For this cause I will confesse to thee, among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy Name.* And againe he sayth, *Rejoyce ye Gentiles with his people.* And againe; *Praise Jehovah all ye Gentiles. Laud him all ye people; for his mercy is mightie towards us, and the faithfullnesse of Jehovah endureth for ever.* *Psal. 117.* And againe *Esay* as sayth, *There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reigne over the Gentiles, and in him shall the Gentiles trust.* And David saith

* Rom. 15. 8,
9, 10, 11, 12.

11. 8. 10. 11.

in *Psal. 22. 28, 29. 31.* All the ends of the earth shall remember, and turne to *Jehovah*, and all families of the *Heathens* shall do worship before thee, for to *Jehovah* pertaines the kingdome; and he is Ruler among the Nations, &c. A seed shall serve him, it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation. Observe how the Scriptures here doe set forth the excellent benefits which appertain to all the *Saints* in generall, and to the holy families in particular, under the flourishing time of the Gospel. Here is great occasion for the *Saints* to glorify, to magnifie, to confesse, to praise, and to laud the great God of heaven and earth, who hath so far magnified his word, so strongly confirmed his promises made unto the fathers, and hath so largely extended his Gospel-priviledges unto them, and to their seed: Their seed are in the blessing; It shall (sayth David) be accounted unto the Lord for a generation. Weigh these sentences, and compare the same with *Gen. 17. 10.* where the Lord sayd unto Abraham, Thou shalt keepe my Covenant, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations. And so it is sayd here in *Psal. 22.* that a seed shall serve him. Now to serve him indeed, is to keep his Covenant, and those that keep his Covenant, are obedient to his lawes and ordinances, which he prescribeth; And as Abraham and his seed then were accounted of before the Lord, so are the believing Gentiles & their seed now; they are counted before the Lord for a generation: for time was when they were not accounted before the Lord for a generation, no reckoning was made of the Nations, they were without Christ, being aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the Covenants of promise, having no hope; and without God in the world; (mistake me not, I doe not say, that the believing Gentiles (or Proselytes) or their infants were without Christ, or without God in the world, when God took them in his Covenant, be it far from me so to thinke! for these visible Saints were no further off then the believing Jewes*;) But the Apostle declareth that such aliens as were then without God in the world; Now God of his rich mercy hath called them unto him by repentance; and now God calling them his people, who were not his people, and making them of Lyons, Lambs, bringing them into subjection to his lawes, and to the obedience of his faith, they are holy and spirituall, and accounted as precious as Abraham and his infants were; for these Gentiles, who sometimes were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ; And he hath accepted of them joyntly into his service, giving them the blessing of Abraham* and his posteritie,

Eph. 2. 11, 12.

* See *Gen. 17. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.*
Exod. 12. 48.

1 Cor. 7. 14.

Eph. 2. 13, 14.

* *Gen. 12. 3. Gal. 3. 8. 14.*

- b Psal. 22. 30.
 1 Cor. 7. 14.
 1 Pet. 2. 9.
 Rev. 1. 6.
 Isa. 19. 18. &c.
- c Rom. 10. 12.
 Rev. 22. 14.
- d Gal. 3. 28.
 e Ver. 29.
 Luk. 19.
 f Gal. 3. 29.
 g Eph. 3. 6.
 h Gal. 4. 28.
 i Gal. 3. 9.
 k Rom. 11. 19.
 20, 21, 22, 23, 24.
 l Eph. 1. 3.
- m Gen. 17. 11,
 12, 13.
 Exod. 12. 48.
- n Col. 3. 11, 12
- o Act. 16. 15.
 1 Cor. 16. 33.
 * Gen. 17. 23.
 9 10. 12.
 & 30. 25. 30.
 & 45. 10. 11.
 18, 19.
 & 46. 5, 6, 7.
 Exod. 1. 1.
 Num. 3. 15, 39.
 Psal. 115. 12,
 13, 14.
 Luk. 19. 9.
 Prov. 31. 15.
 1 Tim. 5. 8.
- steritie, accounting of them before him, as a holy generation.*
Whereas before they were visibly of no account, of no estimation
in the sight of God, or his people. But God of his rich mercy
made them rich, yea (in generall) equally rich with the Jewes in
respect both of externall and internall precious priviledges. The
same God over all, (sayth the Apostle) is rich unto all that call upon
him; their riches are not lessened (or diminished) one jot, they
are equallized with the riches of the Jewes; let them be bond or free,
male or female, they are all one in Christ, Abrahams seed; like Zache-
us, and heires according to promise, fellow-heires, and of the same body,
and partakers of his promise by the Gospell: The children of the pro-
mise as Isaac was, Blessed with their faithfull father Abraham
grafted into the same stocke, and olive tree and root, from whence
the unbelieving Jewes for unbelieve were cut off; and these beleevers
the Apostle concludeth are blessed by God the Father with all spiritu-
all blessings in heavenly places in Christ; and therefore I see no rea-
son why the beleeving parents now (though Gentiles) should not
have the like precious priviledges for their seed in infancie as their
brethren and Countrimen had in former time for their seed in in-
fancie; Yea, considering that the infants of beleevers now are able
to doe, as good, great, faithfull, and acceptable service, as the in-
fants of beleevers in the time of the Law; and that these are ac-
ceptable of Baptisme [this passive Ordinance,] as those were of Circum-
cision [that passive Ordinance,] which was no more passive then this
and was the forerunner of this; and both that and this being in one
generall institution, and one and the same in effect; we may safely
believe and justly conclude, that the Saints infants ought to be
baptized; as formerly they were Circumcised; yea, and for as much
as the Apostles themselves (speaking generally of baptizing whole
households;) never once make mention of the exempting of any of
their infants; (though it be a matter of so great concernment,
how then shall we reject them? And considering that in the Scrip-
ture, by the speech of an house, familie, or household, infants are al-
so implied therein, (and seeing Baptisme is come in the roome of
Circumcision,) If infants should not have been baptized, as formerly
they were circumcised, sure the Apostles, in speaking generally of
baptizing households, would not (without exception of infants)
have used such tearmes as are let downe in the old and new Testa-
ment, to include infants. Considering that then the Apostles

had a just occasion to exclude their *infants* in expresse words, if any such thing should have been done. If holy *infants* should have been thrust out from being *members* of the *visible Church*, and from having their *spirituall priviledges*, as they have had heretofore; Surely, we should have found some tittle of it in the *New Testament*; but there is not the least shew of it, from whence wee may draw any just consequence, for dismissing them from being *members* of the *visible Church of Christ**, and having their *spirituall priviledges*, as they have had heretofore.

Consider thoroughly, the words of *Peter*, how at the very preaching the *Gospel of Repentance* to the *parents*, in the application thereof, he did not barre out, but expressly mentioneth their *children*; and if wee doe but seriously weigh the *Text*, and compare it with other places of Scripture, which set forth the *blessednes* of the *children* with the *parents*, we may well conceive that it is meant of holy *infants* (as hath been formerly observed:) And as I plead for none to be baptized before they doe believe, so I plead for none to have the *Gospel* applyed unto them, before they have faith by imputation, and that is to be judged by some *visible rule* out of Gods *Word*; But, the *infants* of *beleevers* have faith by imputation (as is proved before) therefore (in this consideration) they are *beleevers*, *holy*, and *spirituall**, and therefore the *Gospel* may be lawfully applyed unto them^b; and what letteth water, that these may not be baptized, which have received the holy Spirit as well as wee^c; As for actual profession, or verball demonstration of faith, God hath not required the *children* of *beleevers* to performe in their owne persons, in the time of their *infancie*; which thing though they are not able to doe, yet they are in the *faith* of *Christ*, and shall certainly be saved, though they die in their *infancie*; for God will be no more wanting unto them, then to their *parents*^d.

It is to be minded, that God (baptizing* many families^e) did not exempt such *children* from the *parents*, but baptized those persons that passed through the *Sea*, both men, women, and children, young and old. And so in the midst of their afflictions, by this miracle, gave these faithfull persons a glimpse of that which should be in the *dayes* of the *Messias*, where one element, and passive ordinance, should be generall for all his precious *Saints*, both young and old. So the *Apostles* baptizing many families, did not omit their *infants*; neither can wee finde in all the *New Testament*, that ever the

D

infants

*Mr. Spilsbery
saith it is a
truth that the
Church of the
New Testa-
ment consti-
steth both of
Jewes and
Gentiles, and
admits of all
that beleeve
and reject
none. And for
the Gentiles
Infants being
in the same
body as well
as the Jews in-
fants, this
(saith he) I be-
leeve both a-
like. For this
see his treatise
of bapt. p. 11.
a 1 Cor. 7. 14.
b Mar. 10. 13.
16.
Mat. 19. 13.
14. 15.
Luk. 18. 15.
16. 17.
See Luk. 1. 76.
c Acts 16. 47.
d Isa. 22. 24.
Heb. 13. 8.
e 1 Cor. 10. 1.
2.
f Ex. 12. 31.
37. 41.
Pl. 77. 17. 19.
20.
g Heb. 11. 19.

infants of the faithfull are exempted, in expresse words, nor can it be gathered by necessary consequence. The Apostle Peter maketh the Baptisme in the Arke equivalent with our Baptisme now; And Paul declared that he would not have the believing Corinthians ignorant, that God baptized his Church then, which consisted of many families, in which there were many infants, who were the approved subjects of Circumcision, and of that Baptisme then; And therefore Baptisme now, being a [generall] ordinance, [yea and alwayes] [more generall] in the administration, then Circumcision ever was, yea, and it being given to all the visible members of Christs body, (amongst whom the infants of believing parents are no small number,) they ought to be baptized, both male, and female, thereby to set forth the excellent benefits which they have by Christ.

A. R. **A** Third [argument] of theirs (say you) is from 1 Cor. 7. 14. where it is said, *Else were your Children uncleane, but now are they holy: Whence (you say) they thus reason; If the Children of believing parents be holy, (that is to say, in the new Covenant) they may have the scales of the Covenant, and be baptized. To which I adde this argument, both for explanation, and confirmation of the former.*

All those persons whom wee ought to judge to have the visible Seale (even the holy Spirit of promise, Eph. 1. 13.) ought to be esteemed spiritually holy, and in the new Covenant, and ought to be baptized. *Act. 10. 47. But the infants of (one or both) believing parents, ought to be esteemed to have the invisible Seale, even the holy Spirit of promise; 1 Cor. 7. 13, 14. Therefore the infants of (one or both) believing parents, ought to be judged spiritually holy, and in the new Covenant, and ought to be baptized.*

Your Reasons that they are not in the new Covenant, are
 * First, Because there is now but one Covenant on foot, which is a Covenant of grace and salvation.

A. R. Secondly, Because there is but one manner of entering and being in that Covenant.

Thirdly, That there is but one holiness, now acceptable with God, which is inward spiritual.

To which I answer, that the like you may say of the members of the visible Church, which doe actually and verbally professe faith. As if you should say thus unto them; There is but one new Covenant

now on foot, therefore you (beleevers) are not in it.

This reason is threed-bare.

Secondly, There is but one manner of entering and being in that Covenant, therefore you are not of that Covenant. This is as poor as the other.

Thirdly, Because there is no holinesse accepted with God, but that which is inward, spirituell, and in truth &c. Therefore you beleevers are not in the new Covenant, nor ought to be baptized. Is not this mad kind of reasoning? But to performe that which you promised, you should have proved, that the infants of beleevers are not spiritually holy, nor never did, or can enter in the new covenant, and then I would have said, you had done somewhat like to that you tooke upon you to doe, but instead of taking away the position, that infants are holy and in the new covenant, you tell us, that there is but one covenant; the manner of entering into it and abiding in it but one; the holinesse now acceptable with God so be but one; To which I further answer, that though a person be not holy [internally,] nor under the new covenant [in Gods secret account] yet [in our account] he is to be esteemed to be in the new covenant. An hypocrite may make a glorious shew, yea and seeme in outward acts of obedience to goe further then a true Saint, He may give his goods to the poore and his body to be burned, and yet want love.

Ob. But peradventure you will aske how then we must judge of an hypocrite?

An. Surely, as the faithfull Disciples of Christ judged of Judas; Judas had, a Saint-ship, an Apostle-ship, and a Deacon-ship. Symon Magus also had an [outward] Saint-ship upon him; An hypocrite (or saint outwardly) (I say) must be judged to be as a [true] Saint is, till he be discovered to us, for though God know the heart, yet wee do not, though he see invisibly, we cannot; We must judge of invisible things, by visible demonstrations. Some men may creep in, and make a [faire] shew outwardly for a while, yea and a great while, and yet be hypocrites, but tell they are discovered to be evill, what man can poynt them out, and say from his own knowledge that they are not under the new covenant.

A perso that offers to joyn himself to a particular Church of Christ, and [not only by his verball confession, but by his life and conversation] appeareth unto them to be an out-side Christian, (they knowing nothing

Mat. 10.
1, 2, 4, 16.
Mark. 3. 14.
& 6. 7.
Luke. 1. 16.
John. 1. 24. 5.
& 13. 29.
* Act. 8. 12. 13.
1 Cor. 1. 10.
2 Cor. 1. 12.
Gal. 1. 10.
Eph. 1. 10.
Phil. 1. 10.
Col. 1. 10.
1 Tim. 1. 10.
2 Tim. 1. 10.
Tit. 1. 10.
Heb. 1. 10.
1 Pet. 1. 10.
2 Pet. 1. 10.
1 John. 1. 10.
2 John. 1. 10.
3 John. 1. 10.
Revel. 1. 10.

nothing by him but good) if they refuse him, it is their sinne; though all which he doth (outwardly) is fained.

A humane creature though he have the wisdom & knowledge of Angels, yet can he not know what is in man, none (I say) knoweth this but only the man Christ; wherefore it is apparent that though none are by us to be esteemed spiritually holy but those that are outwardly in the same new covenant in which the visible Church is; yet all the members therein ought so to be esteemed, till they are seen to degenerate.

And moreover, I would have you to know, that God doth not only accept of our inward performances, but of our very words, yea of all externall holy performances, in his worship and service, if they be done according to his will; so David saith, Let the [words of my mouth] and the meditations of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight*; So that though all our worship and service unto God, ought to be spirituall, and done in spirit, and in truth, yet, God hath not bound us to doe it only internally, and not externally also; yea, for as much as he hath made us bodies, as well as soules and spirits, therefore he doth require outward performances of us, as well as inward, but when his saints are not capable; God then doth accept of them neverthelesse, and imputeth Christ righteousness unto them notwithstanding their naturall weaknesse; Let them (while they are capable) keep themselves unspotted, and doe that which God requirerh, and then (when they are no more capable to know or do any spirituall action) they are still not only knowne of God, but beloved of Christ, and sanctified by the holy Spirit; for though they cannot apprehend Gods working in them, yet God can tell how he worketh in them, and sayeth them [by the imputation of Christ righteousness]; And after this manner doth God worke in the hearts of beleevers: So long as they are not capable, he doth not require them to act but to suffer, as holy infants in former time suffered, not only the administration of his passive ordinance* of circumcision, but also death* it selfe (for his sake) from the hands of Gods enemies.

But your inference from your foregoing reasons is; That if beleevers children be in the covenant, and have this true holinesse, then all the children of beleeving parents must be saved, as well old children as young, for age doth not make them cease from being their children. But all the children of beleevers are not saved, no not of faithfull Abraham.

* Psal. 19. 14.

Holinesse both inward and outward is accepted of God.

* Mat. 28. 20.

Rev. 13. 11.

Zach. 14. 16,

17, 18, 19.

Luke 22. 19,

20

1 Cor. 5. 3.

& 6. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

20. & 16. 1, 2.

Act. 1. 26,

& 2. 42.

Iam. 2. 18.

* Pl. 3. 2.

Rom. 4. 6.

* Gen. 17. 14,

23

Ios. 5. 3. 7. 8.

* Ex. 1. 22.

Act. 7. 19.

1 Sam. 22. 19.

A. R.

Pag. 4. l. 13. to

l. 24.

ham himselfe, according to that known sentence of the Prophet Isaiah. 10. 21. Repeated by Saint Paul Romans. 9. 27. Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet but a remnant of them shall be saved: Therefore the children of beleevers are not in the covenant now on foot, nor ought to be baptized.

To which I Ans. That beleevers children are in the covenant, is true; but that [all] the children of [all] beleevers are in the covenant, is not true, but all their holy infants are, and ought so to be judged, & accounted even in the state of salvation, as well as the greatest verbal professors of the faith of Christ, and all these infants of beleeving parents that live till they come to yeares of discretion, are still to be accounted holy and spirituall, except they apostate.

Now though the Scripture declareth that a remnant shall be saved, yet we are directed, by the rule of Gods Word, to judge, that beleeving parents, and their seed that doe not degenerate, are of this remnant. But the children of beleevers in their infancie have not power actually to degenerate from the righteous steps of their holy parents. But *ould* children may possibly. So Ishmael [when he was an infant] was not a mocker neither was Cain [in his infancie] a murtherer: but when they came to yeares, and acted these wickednesses, they were for the same cast out, the one from communion with the familie of Adam*; the other from the familie of Abraham*.

*Gen. 4. 11.

14. 16.

*Gen. 21. 9.

10.

And as you reason here against beleevers infants being in the new Covenant, because you know not absolutely whether they shall be saved. So you may reason against the parents themselves, though they are members of the visible Church, and also as well plead against every verbal professor, that is, a visible member of the same body.

Thus, All you which seem to be beleevers, are a people which have indeed taken upon you the profession of the great name of God, and have given up your selves unto him, to walke in all his wayes, and say, you have taken hold of Gods Covenant, and have covenanted together to become an entire body, City, House, Temple, Garden, Vineyard, &c. unto God, whom you suppose to be your builder and planter, &c. So you thinke your selves to be his holy people, his bride by marriage, his peculiar treasure, in covenant with him, &c. But alas! you are much deceived, you thinke your selves to be in a holy and happie estate, in Covenant with God, and that you have right to his Ordinances, but it is not so. For, then

it will follow, That if you beleivers [members of this visible Church] be in the Covenant, and have this true holinesse, then every member of you must be saved as well old as young, &c. But all the members of the visible Church are not saved [no, not of the Christian Church in the Apostles time, for divers of them perished, as Judas Iscariot, [one of the Twelve Apostles] and Simon Magus: Therefore, though you profess faith, you are not in the Covenant now on foot, nor ought to be baptized.

If this be a good and sufficient ground, or reason, to prove the parents not to be in the new Covenant, nor to be baptized, then the same reason is of force, against the infants of beleivers, to prove them also not to be in the new Covenant, nor to be baptized. But this is very weak, against such parents. Therefore it is of no force, against their infants.

Seeing it is so, you may plainly perceive that I have just ground to except against your conclusion, that because all the children of beleivers are not saved, Therefore the infants of beleivers are not in the Covenant now on foot, nor ought to be baptized.

Such an excuse as this might as well have served in former time for the children of Israel, that they might not onely have neglected Circumcision, but also, all other Ordinances: But such arguing bringeth large liberty tending to *Athisme*, destruction, and ruination of the foundation of Christian Religion.

But what saith Paul, (when he declareth that the Jewes had the Oracles of God committed unto them) what if some did not believe, shall their unbelieve make the faith of God of none effect, God forbid, yea, let God be true, and every man a liar, &c.

The Apostasy of Cain, could not hurt Adam, nor hinder him from eternall life. For though Cain and his seed perished, yet God was still good unto his Church, unto Israel, to those that were of an upright heart.

Furthermore, for to maintain error, you bring error, false things, to prove a falshood, (like two false witnesses that stand one for another,) for, to prove your own false affirmation, that infants are not in the Covenant outwardly, nor have that holinesse whereby to be admitted now to the outward ordinance of baptism, as infants were then to Circumcision in the time of the Law, and state of the Jewes.

You say, That the state or Church of the Jewes, were under the old Covenant and Law, and stood not by faith and circumcision of the heart, (as this Church of the Gospel doth) but stood meerly upon nature and cir-

cumcision

Pag. 4. l. 22, 23

Rom. 8. 1, 2, 3

Pag. 4. l. 19.

circumcision of the flesh, and accordingly had their outward and fiderall holinesse, and outward cleansings, all which are abolished with that state, and no such holinesse or distinction is now between any persons in the world, as (you say) shall be further declared by and by.

To which I answer, That the Church of the Jews were in the old Covenant and Law, is true, But that they stood not by faith and circumcision of the heart, as this Church of the Gospel doth, but stood meerly upon nature and circumcision of the flesh, is not true, for the Church of the Jewes had the new covenant * that was confirmed to Abraham before, of God in Christ, which covenant the Law which was foure hundred and thirty yeares after coul not disanull that it should make the promise of none effect *.

The Jewes were Gods holy speciall ^a and peculiar ^b people, who were not constituted of a visible mixt multitude of (prophane persons, and holy beleivers and Infidels,) good and bad together ^c, but were a people called ^d and separated ^e from other Nations, God brought them out of Egypt ^f, and baptized them in the cloud, and in the sea ^g and went before them, by day in a pillar of cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire ^h, and at the great and victorious deliverance which they had over the Egyptians, they beleevd his Words, and sang his praise ⁱ, then God led them through the wildernesse ^k, and made the bitter waters sweet for them ^l, that they might trust in him who healed them ^m; and he fed them with Manna, which neither they nor their fathers knew, to the intent that they might know, that man could not live by bread only, but by every word of God ⁿ, and he made the flinty rock a fountain of waters ^o, that they thereby might quench their thirst: Yea, The Lord came from mount Synay, and rose up from Seir, unto them, he shined forth from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of his Saints, from his right hand went a fiery Law, yea, he loved the people ^p, they were therefore to trust stedfastly in God, the sword of their excellencie ^q, and to look continually for eternall life of him, and cleave unto him ^r who was their life and the length of their dayes ^s, whom they were commanded to fear and to love, and to serve, with all their heart, and with all their soule ^t, so the Lord was with them, & they with him, and as he had commanded them, so they were still to be a holy people to the Lord their God, even as he was holy ^u.

By all which it appears that there was a manifest difference put between them and the prophane of the world, as is between Christ and Antichrist.

* Mr. Syttsbery granteth the Covenant made with Abraham, and the Covenant now to be the same in substance. See his treatise, pag. 8 line. 10.

* Gen. 17. Gal. 3. 16, 17. a Deut. 7. 6.

b & 26. 18. 19. c & 29. 18. & 32. 9. 12.

d & 41. 1. 2. e & 43. 10. 11. Mat. 12. 2. 13.

f Ps. 135. 4. & 148. 14. & 149. 2.

g Deut. 33. 29. & 14. 1. 2. f Ex. 12. 41.

h 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. b Ex. 13. 21, 22. i Ex. 15. 1.

k Ps. 106. 12. l Ex. 15. 12. m ver. 25.

n v. 26. o Deut. 8. 3. p Ps. 114. 8.

q Num. 20. 8. 11. r Deut. 33. 2, 3. s ver. 29.

t & 10. 30. u & 30. 19, 30. f Deut. 10. 12.

g Levit. 11. 44. & 19. 2. & 20. 7.

^a See Cant.

^b Rev. 21. 3.

^c Gal. 3. 16, 17.

^d Deut. 30. 11.

12, 13, 14.

Rom. 10. 6, 7.

8, 9, 10.

Esay. 63. 9.

^e Deut. 10. 15.

^f Cap. 14. 1.

^g Cap. 7. 7, 8.

^h Cap. 30. 19.

20

ⁱ Deut. 30. 6.

^k Gen. 17. 11.

^l Rom. 4. 11.

Col. 2. 11, 12.

^m Esay. 2. 6, 9.

ⁿ Esay. 56.

33, 35, 36, 37, 38.

^o Jer. 9. 25, 26.

^p Rom. 11. 20.

^q v. 21.

^r v. 22.

^s v. 23.

Inbrief, as their Church was the Church of Christ, and the Covenant^b which they had^c the Covenant of Christ, so the Commandment^d (or word) which was not hid from them was the Gospel, (which they were not to enquire after, as though it were some strange thing afar off, or beyond the seas, &c. for it was nigh unto them, in their mouth and in their heart, that they might doe it) even the Gospel of Christ, the same word of faith which Paul preached; yea, further they had not onely the Gospel of Christ, but Christ himselfe, his presence, in a speciall manner amongst them, though he were not then manifested in the flesh.

Wherefore I would have you to consider, and revoke those rash speeches, that this heavenly society and blessed fraternity, stood not by faith but meerly upon nature and circumcision of the flesh.

It is an infidelious opinion to judge them to be Infidels (in the Jewes state) whom God did so call and separate, which had his Oracles and Ordinances, whom he called his holy people, his chosen^e and peculiar people^f, his beloved ones^g, to whose seed he promised life as to themselves^h whose hearts he promised to circumcise, as also the hearts of their seedⁱ (as he hath promised to his people in the last dayes) which thing, circumcision of the flesh was to teach them, it being the signe^k and seal^l of the righteousness of faith, as baptism is now. And this you may minde also, that though the rebellious seed of Abraham (according to the flesh) were rejected^m, yet the strangers that joyned to the Lord were still receivedⁿ, wherefore this is a plain evidence, that they stood by the grace and life of God and Christ, and circumcision of the heart, for the cause why God rejected some of the circumcised seed of Abraham according to the flesh, was, because they were uncircumcised in heart^o, and therefore the Lord threatned to visite them (and did visit them) with the uncircumcised in flesh.

Wherefore it appeareth, that without faith and circumcision of the heart they could not stand at all.

And the Scripture saith, that the unbelieving Jewes were cut off for unbelieve, and that those that stand doe stand by faith, and therefore are admonished not to be high minded but fear^p, and take heed^q and continue in the beautifulnesse of God^r, and that the unbelieving Jewes also if they abide not in unbelieve, shall be grafted in again^s.

Wherefore it appeareth, that as unbelieve was the cause why the unbelieving Jewes were cut off from the olive tree, whereon they were

were

were, so unbelieve was the bar, which kept them off, for if they abide not in unbelieve, they shall be grafted in again; and this proveth that their standing was never to be otherwise but by faith and circumcision of the heart.

Neither are we to thinke, that the giving of the Law at mount Sinai, or the ceremonies which the Jewes then had to lead them to Christ, or any of Gods Oracles being committed unto them, or any persons groundlesse departing from the State, doth argue that the constitution of the same Church was, as you would have it taken to be; Neither did their circumcision of the flesh argue that they stood not by faith, and circumcision of the heart, no more then the outward baptisme doth now argue, that the Saints now, stand not by faith, and the inward baptisme of the heart and spirit, but merely upon nature and baptisme of the flesh.

But you should know, that as it is not possible to please God now without faith *, no more was it then *. In the time of the Law, God abhorred his own Ordinances if they were not done in faith *.

* Heb. 11. 6.

* Psal. 50. 18.

* Isa. 1. 13, 14.

And as faith gave Abraham the denomination of Gods friend, (the righteousness of which faith, Circumcision was a seal *;) so none were ever esteemed as the holy people, the sonnes and daughters and friends of God, but those that were made nigh unto him by the promise of Christ, and by faith, and circumcision of the heart.

* Rom. 4. 11.

And you should know, that the Jewes had not outward spiritual holinesse visibly imputed unto them merely because they were the children of Abraham, but because Abraham their Father and they his children were the children of God, and their childrens children were in Covenant, and so they were the children of the promise as Isaac was, and blessed with their Father Abraham.

And this may further appeare unto you, because when any of the seed of Abraham (according to the flesh) did degenerate, their rejection was not for (or because) that they were the children of Abraham; but because they had taken upon them the image of Satan, and so degenerated from the steps of Abraham, and thereby became the children of Belial.

And as we may say concerning these Hebrews, so we may say concerning the Heathens, when any of the Gentiles, (or Heathens) became Proselytes, their children that were at yeares of discretion were not to be circumcised, unless they were willing to enter into

covenant with God, and to take upon them the Lords yoke, and fight under his banner; Howbeit, whether they were circumcised or not, they were still the Proselytes children, according to the flesh.

But concerning the infants of the Proselytes, there was no questioning of them, they were to be circumcised (being in the covenant with their parents,) and yet not circumcised because they were their children by nature; but because they were in the same covenant with their holy parents, and so they were the children of God, by his free Grace.

And the Scripture doth evidently declare that none were to be admitted into the Church of the Jewes, but believing Hebrews, and Proselytes, and their holy seed. By all this it appeareth that the members of the Jewes had a special holiness upon them, and stood no otherwise but by faith, and circumcision of the heart. And were not as those who were neither believing Jewes, nor Proselytes; Aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel, without hope, without God in the world, without Christ, and stranger from the covenants of promise. But the Church of the Jewes, (the Lords peculiar people) were made nigh unto God by the blood of Jesus Christ, which was then to be shed; and is now shed for the remission of their sins, and their reconciliation to God the Father, and his blessed spirit.

And whereas you say that they had no Church of the Jewes, I bolliſhed.

Tell you, I am not bound to believe that God abolished his Church here, whenof David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Josiah, and the holy Prophets, and righteous men were members; such a Church as the constitution whereof there was no prophane person, to be admitted, or any sope-brating gall or wormwood to be suffered, but if you thinke that God changed the state in the daies of the Messias, his manifestation in the flesh, and made it more glorious, Even as the Moone is said to be changed when she hath run her course, but remaineth still the same Moone, though more glorious then before, this I would rather believe then that they had yett succeeded in; and yett

And touching your speech of the abolishing of the other things. If you mean an abolishing of all the heggarly rudiments, taking away the shadowe of some Ordinances, and planting other materials in stead thereof, then I grant it; But be sure that you stick to this, that Christ came not to deceive the Infants of believing parents, or to cutt them off from the Church of the Jewes, but to bring them in to the Church of the Gentiles.

parents, to take away the substance of the *Ordinance*, but rather the *gauges* which cleaved thereunto; which *circumstantial things*, he nailed to his *Crosse*, in token that those who rightly and truly enjoyed them before, were now benefited without them, and were to have, through a *generall distribution*, an *equall proportionable share*, and *right*, to whatsoever came in stead thereof.

Now let us consider, that if the *infants of believers*, (members of the *Church of the Jews*) were not then *aliens from the Common wealth of Israel*, nor *without hope*, nor *without God in the world*. They were not then *without Christ*, neither were they *strangers from the Covenants of Promise*.

But the *Infants of believers* (who were members of the *Church of the Jews*) were not *aliens from the Common wealth of Israel*, nor *without hope*, nor *without God in the world*.

Therefore such *holy Infants* were not then *without Christ*, neither were they *strangers from the covenants of promise*.

Now, far as much as the *Infants of believers* were *without Christ*, nor *aliens from the Common wealth of Israel*, nor *strangers from the Covenants of promise*, *nor without hope*, nor *without God in the world*.

They were such as were made *high by the bloud of Christ*, whose bloud was then to be shed, and is poured out for them; and therefore we may safely conclude, that the *holy Infants* are not *foolers* by his coming. And therefore [seeing the *Old Covenant* is not abolished] it evidently appeareth, that the *Infants of believers* now are in the *new Covenant*, because the *Infants of believers* were in the *same New Covenant* before. And this agreeth with the words of the *Apostle Paul*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. *Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*, for the *Apostle* there speaketh to *believers*, and of a *holinesse* in relation to their faith, and to the *covenant* they were in.

And though you said, the *old Covenant* is *abolished*, yet you grant that the *New Covenant* is not *abolished* but *remaineth*; Wherefore you must of necessity be driven to grant also, that the *Infants of believers* are in the *new Covenant*, because they were of it before, and the *New Covenant* remaineth *permanent*.

Thus having taken away the foundation of your *Arguments* which you brought (against *holy Infants* being in the *Covenant*) you may justly expect, that all which is builded upon the same *foundation*, will fall to the ground.

* Eph. 2. 12

* Gen. 17. 13.

Deut. 29. 10.

11. 12. 13. 14.

15. 18.

Exod. 12. 48.

49.

See Eph 2. 13.

Page 4. li. 37.

Your next words are these which follow; *There being the covenant now on foot, which is a covenant of grace and salvation, which brings salvation to all those that rightly enter into it, which is only by faith.* Hence it is said, *Act. 2. 47. That the Lord did to the Church daily such as should be saved.*

Ans. That the new Covenant is now on foot, and that it is the covenant of grace, and salvation, and brings it to all those which rightly enter into it in deed and in truth, is not by me denied. And that entrance is onely by faith, is very true. But mind this, that there is an external sight, and an internal right. We [finite creatures] cannot judge of the tree by the fruit, of the faith by the workes; for he had no internal right, for he was a devill inwardly, yet he had external right, for he was a Saint outwardly. But so long as he was not known to be a wicked man, but still made a great outward show of holiness, they were to judge him righteous; But when he manifested evill fruits, of meekness and hypocrisy, then they were to alter their former charitable opinion of him; And though he had (onely an outward fellowship, but also) an Apostleship, and a Discipleship before; yet when he Apostasied, that man who was before accounted a Saint and an Angel on earth, was afterward to be esteemed as a devill. And so the like may be said concerning our wicked man. See how an office even his, who is called a Church Holy man, and let the Church say Amen to his right hand, when he is judged, let him be condemned: and let his prayer become silence. Let dayes be few, and another take his office. [Amen.] Let his children be fatherlesse, and his wife a widow. Let his children be continually famished, and begge. Let them seek their bread abroad of their neighbours. Let the extortioners swallow him, and let the Jews spoyle his labour. Let there be no mercy shewed unto him: neither there be any to favour his fatherlesse-children. Let his posterity be pointed in cutting off, in the generation next after, let his name be forgotten. Let the remembrance of his [father] be remembered of Jehovah; and let the name of his mother be brought down. Let him be before Jehovah continually, that he may cut off the memory of them from the earth, &c.

Now that the Lord added to his Church daily such as should be saved, is certaine; but here we are to note, that his Church in Jerusalem was a particular Church. And that (as far as men can judge) all those were such justification outwardly appeared, and rightly added to the same, or to any other particular Church.

Mat. 12: 33.

Luke 6. 44.

5 Jan. 2. 18, 19

• Joh. 6. 70, 71

AB: 1: 17.

2000

1990

10

100

100

2003-04-23

PG-147-2-10

Pfal 60 38

36 37 38

* Pfal. 190-6

7.8.9.10.11.

13-13-14-15

16, 17, 18, 19

[20.]

1992

100

100

22

1998

10

1990

100

the same constitution; And though the Lord added to his Church daily such as should be saved; yet wee are not to determine that all that joyned to a particular Church were saved; yea though they were added rightly according to order, in an externall way. Judas was of the visible Church, yea of that Church whereof these were members, and yet wee will not say that he is saved. Persons may be saved which are of no visible particular Church; And persons may be of a true visible particular Church of Christ, and yet Apostates; and not be saved, any more then Judas, who fell finally, as other reprobates doe, though never so eminent in the Church. Howbeit, we will not say that any fall away, from the grace of Gods secret election, but from an outward sanctification, it is possible that elected persons may for a time fall; yet not without great sinne, no more then the temporary falling away of the incestuous person in the Church of Corinth, and others also, which the Scripture maketh mention of, who were the deare Saints of God, yet (for a time) fell from their stedfastnesse.

But now I will examine your reasons what they are, whereby you say, That the holinesse of children here, is not meant of any holinesse imputation to any Church-covenant.

First, (say you,) That which is an effect of regeneration, is not brought to passe by generation (though the parents be holy) but to be of the fruitfull Kingdom, is the proper effect of regeneration. John 3:31 Without which none can see it (much lesse be of it) or enter into it; therefore it cannot be brought to passe by generation, though the parents are holy.

That regeneration is brought to passe by generation, I will not affirme; The infants of believers are regenerated [before they are borne] this you cannot justly deny; for Jeremie and John Baptiste were sanctified in the wombe; and the priviledges of believers are alike precious. Not that it cometh by the means of their naturall birth, or generation after the flesh; but by the Spirit of regeneration; howbeit, it is a certaine truth, that the Saints generation doth not hinder regeneration [in any of them:] Generation doth not worke regeneration, but generallly causeth distinction of persons, that what was one in the root, is become more in the branches; or what was one in such a branch growing on such a roote, bringeth forth other branches, or (as it were) little springes, who are in a growing condition (or in a way of thriving) so long as they are borne up and receive nourishment

* Pag. 4. lin. 4.
Pag. 5. lin. 1, 2

* Pag. 5. lin. 3.
to lin. 9.

Abrahams holy action was Levies by imputation. See Heb. 7. 9.

ment from the *roote*. And this division, or distinction, by way of derivation, doth not simply make qualities contra-distinct and opposite one to the other, or break the conjunction or contraction between them; or take away the vertue of the *roote* from them. For *Abrahams* act of obedience which he did before *Levi* was an infant, was imputed unto *Levi* afterward, which act was an act of obedience, even a fruit of faith, which cannot be without the Spirit.

Now when *Levi* was borne, should they have sayd, that he was an *unregenerated* Infant? Nay, rather it may be thought that they esteemed as well of *Levi* (in his infancie) as *Eve* did of *Seth* in his infancie, when *Seth* was borne, shee did not say, *God hath sent mee a young Heathen* (or *Canite*) (though the seed of *Caine* was here by generation) but (saith shee) *The Lord hath sent mee [another seed] in stead of [Abel] whom Caine slew*. Mark now, shee did not say, in stead of *Caine*, or in stead of *Caines* infants, (which did indeed spring naturally from *Adams* loynes;) but in stead of *[Abel]* (saith shee,) Therefore (I say) it is apparent, that (though generation did not worke regeneration, yet) shee believed in *God*, and had some faith, to put a real difference between *Apostates*, and those who were not *Apostated*, but were spiritually holy: And in that it is said that *Seth* was in stead of *Abel*, it is a plaine Argument, that as *Abel* was in the Covenant, and as *Abel* was a member of the Church, so was *Seth*, according to his name, so was he set (or appointed) in stead of *Abel*; for the saying imports that he took the room of *Abel*, as when one plant is removed out of a fruitfull soyle, and another planted in stead thereof.

And seeing *God* refuseth not the bodies of his Saints, but accepteth of them in his gracious Covenant (though they are generated persons) it plainly argueth that generation doth not hinder regeneration. And therefore it appeareth that this your reason (concerning generation and regeneration) is of no force against the *holy Children* spoken of in *Cor. 7. 14.* but rather maketh for them, as shall be further made to appeare. And all which you have said here doth not prove that the holinesse of *Children* there, is not meant of any holines in relation to any Church Covenant, which is the thing for which you brought it.

The Infants of believers are visibly holy in relation to faith, and the *holy Covenant*. The unbelieving yoke follows abiding faith, and the yoke follows, are sanctified by them for this end, &c.

Children

14. nil. 4. 289 *
2. 1. nil. 2. 289 *
14. nil. 2. 289 *
2. 1. nil. 2. 289 *

14. nil. 4. 289 *
2. 1. nil. 2. 289 *
14. nil. 2. 289 *
2. 1. nil. 2. 289 *

Children unclean, but now are they holy. So sayth the holy Apostle Paul, (1 Cor. 7. 14.) *Your children are holy*, that is to say, the children of you beleivers, (in Covenant with your God) they are the children of the Covenant, differing from those children that are unholy and out of the Covenant.

But against this you argue, that what is an effect of regeneration, is not brought to passe by generation (though the parents be holy, &c.) And I suppose, that those Merit-mongers (keeping still to their principles) may beleeye the contrary. I meane such Merit-mongers, who (against the Gospel of free-grace) do labour vehemently to shut out all beleivers infants from the new Jerusalem, and so doe in their conceptions rank them with dogs and whoremongers without, and judge them not to be in the Covenant, or regenerated (because they have not a naturall capability, to discern, apprehend, and both actually & verbally professe faith, in their own persons; yea, they judge all infants to be visibly in one condition (and out of the Covenant in invisibilitie), without putting any visible distinction between the Infants of the Church, and the Infants out of the Church. But if that which is an effect of regeneration, were to be brought to passe by generation, they might with some colour of truth, ranke them all in one visible estate, (considering that they are all generated.) And then there had been no weight in the Apostles speech concerning this matter. But we are to know that the Apostle had good reason for what he sayd; The Master of spirits was his instructor, whose words are not to be wrested and perverted, and so made of none effect, but are discreetly to be observed, and faithfully obeyed. And though some doe despise the Lords vessels of small quantities, even holy infants, the young Olive plants of beleiving parents, esteeming them unregenerated, yet wee are taught to esteeme highly of them, and to honour them as the precious Saints, whom the most high God hath regenerated, and separated to himselfe, as his peculiar treasure, who are justified, and sanctified, and saved by him; and therefore ought to be sealed unto him by Baptisme, as such holy Infants in the time of the Law were sealed unto him by Circumcision.

And you your selfe doe grant, that to be of the Covenant or Kingdom, is the proper effect of regeneration, Joh. 3. 3. without which none can see it, (much lesse be of it.)

Consider what you say; for here you must confesse, that (seeing all that see the kingdom of God are regenerated) either the Infants of

Rev. 22. 14, 15.

21. 8. BA

Dem. 22. 23

of *beleevers* (which die in their *infancie*) are *regenerated*, or else that they shall never see the *Kingdome of God*, much lesse be of it; But Christ hath testified that the *kingdome of heaven* consisteth of such, and therefore wee may safely conclude, that though they die in their *infancie*, yet they shall see the *kingdome of God*; and therefore it appeareth, that they are *regenerated*.

What will you say now, in answer to your argument; seeing it maketh not against *holy infants*, but for them? Surely you will denie that they have any of the effects of *regeneration*, or else you will denie your owne *argument*! or the *Scripture of God*, (which declareth that they are in *covenant*,) or else confesse, that the *infants of beleevers* are to be accounted *holy persons*, in *covenant with God*, and *heires of his heavenly Kingdome*, according as the *holy Scripture* teacheth us: one of these you will doe, if silence prevent you not.

Moreover, I know not how you take the being in the *Covenant* or *Kingdome*; there is a two-fold being therein, to wit, *externall*, and *internall*; *outward*, and *inward*; *visible*, and *invisible*, (as I observed before, concerning persons enterance into the *Church*.)

Act. 8. 13.

Simon Magus beleeved, and was rightly baptized with the outward Baptisme, therefore by consequence, he was *visibly* in the *Covenant*, even *outwardly*; and *externally*; He was an *elected Saint*, so far as men could or were to judge then at that present time, though his heart was not *upright* in the sight of God; and therefore he was not of Gods *Kingdome*, nor in the *new Covenant* in Gods *secret account*, nor *regenerated*, no more then *Judas Iscariot*, though the *Apostles* themselves esteemed never so highly of him. But the *Infants of beleevers* are *visibly* in the *Covenant*. And wee are to judge all that are in the *Covenant visibly*, to be *elected*, *regenerated*, *sanctified*, *heires of righteousness*, *children of God*, and of his *heavenly Kingdome*, as they appeare unto us, either by some *visible demonstration* of their owne, or *evident manifestation* of others, or *testification* of Gods, not to be that which before wee were to judge them to be.

O minde this well, that *Secret things belong unto the Lord our God*, but those things which are revealed, belong unto us and to our *Children for ever*.

Secondly,

Secondly, (say you*) Contradictions cannot be the effect of one and the selfe-same Covenant, in one and the selfe-same respect; but for one parent to be a beleever, that is, of the Church, when the other parent is not, to produce a holy seed, (that is) in the Covenant, 1 Cor. 7. 14. And for the other parents, to be one a Jew, and the other a Babylonian; the one a member of the Church, the other not, to produce an unholy seed (that is) out of the Covenant, and to be put away, both wife and all borne by her; as Ezra 10. 3. (you say) is a contradiction in one and the selfe-same respect. Therefore it cannot be the effect of one and the selfe-same Covenant.

* Pag. 5. lin. 9.
to lin. 19.

Ans. That is a contradiction which is opposed to a contrary thing, as light is to darknesse. And that is an effect which floweth from a Cause or ground.

The ground why God gave Abraham the signe and seale of his righteousness, was Abrahams faith, in beleieving Gods Covenant; For Abraham had first the Covenant, and faith to lay hold upon it, and afterward the seale thereof. The ground why Abraham did administer Circumcision (Gods holy signe and seale of the righteousness of his faith) was faith, in beleieving the firmenesse of Gods promise, and the effectuall power and efficacie of the Ordinance of Circumcision; which (Circumcision) had the denomination of the Covenant it selfe, because it was a signe thereof. * I say, Abrahams action of Circumcision was done in faith, otherwise it had been sinne unto him *. But he added unto his faith this vertue, (this effect of the New covenant) to yeeld obedience unto God, in performance of this holy Ordinance upon his infants, according to Gods appointment.

Rom. 4. 11.

* Gen. 17. 10.

* Ver. 11.

* Rom. 14. 23.

Baptisme (being come in the roome of Circumcision) though it be more generall, yet it hath an equivolence with Circumcision; Wherefore (it being not contradictory thereunto, but sealing up one and the same Covenant of life) As Circumcision was to be administered upon the infants of beleivers in former time, so Baptisme is to be administered upon the infants of beleivers now.

Col. 2. 11, 12.

Now though every contradiction, argueth a difference, yet every difference, maketh not a contradiction. But to restraine (or lessen) the priviledges of the Saints (under the Gospel) is not onely to make one Covenant contradictory to another, but also the New covenant contradictory to it selfe, which is not of a fading nature, but of a flourishing nature, and hath flourished, (and doth flourish) more under the Gospel, then it did under the Law.

Wherefore if you doe conceive, that 1 Cor. 7. 14. is of a lesser extent then Bar. 10. 3. you are mistaken; but if you will say, 1 Cor. 7. 14. is of a larger extent. Wherefore have you brought Bar. 10. 3. to unfold it? Except it be to prove forcibly hereby (against your selfe,) how that all beleovers infants generally of what Nation soever, have greater priviledges now, since Christs death, then they have had heretofore.

As for the second part of your Argument (considering that it wanteth explanation one way, and proove another way) it will not stand you in any stead, to prove what you would have it prove (to wit) that the holinesse spoken of (1 Cor. 7. 14.) is not a holinesse in relation to any Church-Covenant.

Indeed, if you had set it downe thus; That for one parents to be a belever, and the other an unbeliever, to produce a holy seed in covenant, and the same parents remaining in the same estate without alteration, to bring forth an unholy seed, and out of the Covenant; is a contradiction in one and the selfe-same respect. Or thus. For one parent to be a belever, and another parent to be an unbeliever, to produce a holy seed. And for the like parents in the same respects, to produce an unholy seed, is a contradiction in one and the selfe-same respect. If you had reasoned thus, and so proved it, then you had done somewhat like to your undertakings, but in speaking generally of parents, in covenant, and out of covenant, without noting in particular, the difference that was between these sanctified & unbelieving parents (mentioned in 1 Cor. 7. 14.) and those unbelieving parents (mentioned in Bar. 10. 3.) who were not then sanctified to belevers for that purpose) you even loose your selfe.

But you say, it is a contradiction in one and the selfe-same respect, and have not explained nor declared what it is a contradiction of, whether of the New covenant, or of the old covenant, or of both. Therefore declare plainly, what covenant you thinke the divorcement in Bar. 10. 3. to be an effect of? Was it an effect of the New covenant, or of the old? you may know, that neither covenant did allow them to marry those cursed persons. You ought also to minde, that one Israélite might be divorced from another Israélite in the time of the Law; and this precept was granted and written them by Moses (Deut. 24. 1.) for the hardness of their hearts, (Mat. 19. 8.) But this (in Bar. 10.) was not a bare grant, but an absolute command; not barely permitted (or granted) unto them, for the hardness

ness of their hearts, there is more in it then so. For those wicked persons in whom they formerly took delight, they were forceably to put away, & it was not left to their libertie, whether they would put them away or no, but it was an injunction layd upon them, under penaltie of Gods curse; for they perceived Gods heavie wrath was hanging over their heads, ready to seaze upon them, unless there were some speedy redresse.

And it evidently appeareth, that you have not well read (or considered) the Scripture, for if you had, you would soone have seen a great and weightie reason, pressing these sonnes of God to put away these daughters of men, and those unholy children borne of them, for they (in uniting themselvs thus unto them) had made themselves one with them; yea, they had made themselves one with the abominable Nations (as appeareth by Exra 9. 1 compared with Deut. 7. 26.) *An accursed thing, like the accursed thing; And did not seperate themselves from the people of these Lands, doing according to their abominations.*

And therefore there was a speciall cause why the children of those Idolaters, (in Exra. 10. 3.) should be put away, They were not visibly holy; the wives were not sanctified unto them, to bring forth a visible holy seed. The holy seed was mixed: But the Apostle saith to the beleivers, in 1 Cor. 7. 13, 14, 15. That the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband. *Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy. But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases, but God hath called us to peace.*

Now wee are to take the holinesse and unholinesse, to be a holinesse and unholinesse in reference to visibilitie; for those that were holy visibly, might be unholy invisibly; and those that were unholy, invisibly, might be holy visibly. But the Saints of God were not to judge any holy, except they had cause so to doe, and ground of perswasion arising from some visible demonstration, either from God, or from men, according to the direction of the word. The visible holinesse of these holy children of beleivers, here specified, arose from their visible being in covenant, & from the sanctification of the unbelieving yoke-fellows to their beleiving yoke-fellows. The spirituall uncleannes or unholines w^{ch} the unholy children had, was in reference to visibilitie; & so when he speaketh of holy children, proceeding frō a sanctified wife, he hath reference to visibilitie, the unbelievers are sanctified to the be-

leavers, els were the children unclean, but now are they holy; to wit, in
 stibilitie; for the ground of the childrens visible holinesse was, first, from
 the parents being visibly in covenant; Secondly, from the infants be-
 ing his children, against whom there was no exceptions; they be-
 ing conceived by such a wife, who did not depart from him; and
 therefore the children are visibly holy; Thus when the Vines are visibly
 of the Vine of Sodome and of the feilds of Gomorrha, the grapes are visi-
 bly the grapes of gall, and their clusters are bitter*; but when the wife is
 visibly as a fruitfull Vine by the house-side of him that seareth the
 Lord, the children are (to be esteemed) as Olive plants**.

* Deut. 32. 32.

** Psal. 128. 3. 4

A. R.

* Pag 5. lin. 19.
 to lin. 35.

Thirdly, (say you*) It appeares from the Jewish Church-state,
 from whence this successive holinesse and being in the Covenant is con-
 cluded to come. The Prosolyte that was to be brought in, was to circum-
 cise all his males, Exod. 12. 48. Where wee may conclude, that his fe-
 males were included in that time in the males, there being (say you) no
 other ordinance of admission for them; Whence (you say) it will follow
 that if the Jewes Church-state, from whence (you affirme) this succe-
 sion of being in the Covenant is derived, doth not admit in any considera-
 tion of any lawfull being of parents, the one a member of the Church, the
 other not, to produce a seed within the old Covenant; that then such a thing
 under the new Covenant, cannot be concluded to proceed from that rule,
 but (you affirme) the former is true from the ground before layd, and
 that therefore the later is also true, and if not from that rule, then from
 none. But not from that by consequence of the former argument; therefore
 from none.

* Lin. 19, 20,
 21.

Ans. This is set downe obscurely; You say*, It appeares from the
 Jewish state, from whence this successive holinesse and being in the Cove-
 nant is concluded to come? What successive holinesse? and what being
 and what Covenant doe you here meane? and who are they that
 make this conclusion?

* See before
 pag. 39.

* Gen 17.

* Gal. 3. 27.

* Lin. 11, 12,
 23.

It hath been proved before, that the people of Israel had two
 Covenants*, one established with Abraham*, another long after at
 Mount Sinai*; But for Confirmation of your speech, you say*
 The Prosolyte that was to be brought in, was to circumcise all his males
 Exod. 12. 48. Where wee may conclude, that his females were included
 in that time in the males, there being (say you) no other ordinance of ad-
 mission for them.

Ans. You spake before of a successive holinesse. But what holinesse
 was this which the Prosolytes had, that were never on the Church-state
 before?

before? Was this a *successive holinesse*? Surely this doth not import any other *holinesse*, but what is by *faith* in *Christ*; Wherefore you may see that you have not rightly applied this place of Scripture to prove your *successive holinesse*: It was *faith* professed by the parent that brought in his seed with him; it was not his being *circumcised*, but his *believe*, which was alwayes to goe before, even as *faith* now is to goe before *Baptisme*, and to be professed before a man, or his seed, is to be admitted to the ordinance of *Baptisme*. Now the *Prosolytes* were to *circumcise* all their *males*. But wee doe not reade that the Lord did command the *Prosolytes* to put away their *unbeleeving Wives*, they being married unto them before, (even when they were *Heathens*) but they might still retaine them, and have *children* by them, capable of the ordinance of *Circumcision*. Whereas you speak of *admission*, I thinke you meane admission to the *Passover*, for they made themselves one with the people of God, by beleeving the promises of God, which thing they were to doe before they were *circumcised*, and *circumcision* was administred afterwards, for the *sealing* and *confirming* of that *faith* before professed.

Now how you understand, that the *females* were included in the *males*, I know not.

Whether doe you meane in his *male children*, or some other *males*?

If you say, they were included in his *male children*; Then I put the case, that he had no *males*; how then? were his *females* included in the *males* that were not?!

But your speech, (in charitie) may have this construction, That seeing the Lord did command the *Prosolyte* to *circumcise* his *male children*, that very command did intimate that his *female children* were in the *Covenant*, and according to their *capabilitie* to assent to Gods ordinance, that it was good & holy, though they were not to receive it, yet had a right to whatsoever came in stead thereof. And this beeing not to be received by them *actively*, it must needs be construed that they were *implied imputatively*: This then was a great *priviledge*; for without this *imputative holinesse*, they could not be numbered among the *living in Ierusalem*, but rather counted among the *uncircumcised Philistians*, neither could they without this *imputativenesse* be admitted to receive the *Lords Passover**? which was a figure of our blessed Saviour *Jesus Christ*, our *Passover*, which is sacrificed for

* Isa. 4. 3.

* Exod. 12.

43, 44. 47.

* 1 Cor. 5. 7.

But from hence you collect a supposition, and upon your supposition you ground a position: Your position is, That if the *Jew* Church state (from whence (you would have us take notice that you say) this succession and being in the covenant is derived) doth not admit in any consideration of any lawfull being of parents; the one a member of the Church, the other not to produce a seed within the old Covenant, your position (grounded upon this supposition) is, that then such a thing under the new Covenant, cannot be concluded to proceed from that rule.

Now, it would be knowne, what you meane by parents, whether you meane any parents whatsoever! or but some onely; for it doth not follow, that because some were not admitted, that therefore unbelievers were allowed to abide with their believing yoke-fellows, in producing of a holy seed in Covenant.

But let us see what prooffe you have, upon which you ground your supposition and perswasion.

The former is true (say you) from the ground before layd, and therefore the latter is also true.

To which I answer; I know not (in particular) what ground you here meane! but this may suffice that what you have before layd is answered fully before.

But because you thinke the former to be true, therefore you conclude, the later is also true; and (further you say) if not from that rule, then from none; But not from that by consequence of the former argument, therefore from none.

Now, I know not what you meane by these words; Doe you meane that the former, and later of this your argument is true, from that Rule, and if not from that Rule, then from none; but not from that by consequence of the former Argument, therefore from none!

Surely you are out here, on either side! Neither do I know what Rule you mean, nor what, nor whose Argument you mean: Doe you mean by that Rule, a Rule of Scripture; or only some position grounded upon Scripture; you should know that *Ezra 10.3.* will not beat out your position, neither will any title of Scripture else; for though the *Jewes* were to put away these wives there mentioned, yet it doth not follow (as you would inferre) that therefore the Church of the *Jewes* allowed not in any consideration, of any lawfull being of parents (the one a member of the Church, the other not, to produce a seed within the old Covenant,) (though they allowed not of other some.) And therefore your Argument, both suppositive and positive together

together with the ground, is fallen to the ground, and maketh nothing against holy Infants being visibly in the Covenant with their believing parents.

You should know that it is evill to make any Conclusion, [from any Scripture] which is not concluded thereby, or included therein.

But that the Jewes Church state allowed in no consideration of no lawfull beeing together of parents, the one a member of the Church, the other not, [to produce a holy seed in Covenant;] is not concluded thereby, nor included therein; therefore it is evill to make such a Conclusion therefrom.

But if you meane by Rule, the Rule of Scripture, 1 Cor. 7. 14. or Exod. 12. 48. You may know, that all this maketh nothing for your purpose neither; but is also directly against you.

Now whereas you lay downe, a positive argument, [to confirme your former speeches,] and crosse the same, by saying, and if not from that rule, then from none, but not from that, &c. therefore from none.

I suppose it is some over-sight; Wherefore, I intend not to wade any further to finde out the depth of it, till I see an explanation thereof from you.

But in the meane time, I will give you my conceptions further, concerning Exod. 12. 48 (which is the Scripture cited here by you) and so leave it to your consideration.

God commanded the Proselyte, to Circumcise all his males, Exod. 12. 48. (to wit) all his male Infants (and all those males in his house, who in sincere affection, did desire the ordinance of Circumcision) though his wife (the mother of those Infants) were neither Jew nor Proselyte. And his male Infants [which he had by that woman] were (of necessitie) to be circumcised [in their infancie] and not to be reckoned without, but within the Church of Israel. For we reade that the Lord commanded him to circumcise all his males; but did not joyne him to put away his wife, (which he had before his Conversion) though she were no beleever.

Exod. 12. 48.

Marriage being honourable amongst all men, Heb. 13. 8. Shall wee thinke they were to breake it? An honourable marriage according to Gods ordinance, dissolved without any just cause, or waightie ground, was a derogating from the first institution thereof; and such a thing which we never read, that God commanded or allowed the Proselytes to doe; though their wives could not be perswaded to become Proselytes.

Yea,

Mat. 3. 31, 32.
& 19. 8, 9.

Yea, and though *Christ* himselfe (in some case) doth allow that a man may put away his wife; and *Paul* declareth the same in effect, when he sayth, *If the unbeliever will not abide; a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases (but God hath called us unto peace.)*

Mat. 10. 5, 6,
7, 8, 9, 10, 11,
12.

* Mat. 19. 8.

Yea, and although such a divorce, doth not argue a hard-heartednesse in the partie offended, nor was condemned (but allowed of) in *Christ's* time (though it were done after the manner of *Moses*), yet touching other divorces, which proceeded from a hard-heartednesse, *Christ* did not allow of such, but sayth, *from the beginning it was not so* &c.

And therefore wee are not to imagine, that the Lord did command or injoyne the *Prosolytes* (in the time of the Law) to breake the bond of matrimony; by dissolving that marriage which once was honourable, neither ought we to thinke, that the conversion, or faith of the one parent, made the marriage which before was honourable, any more the dishonourable; and if it did not, then wee may lawfully conclude, that they needed not to be married over againe, or separated the one from the other by divorcement, so long as the unbelievers were content to abide with their believing yoke-fellows, but that they were rather to remaine together in love and amitie, and bring forth a holy seed in Covenant; such a seed who were in their infancie to be ranked with the *Israelites* holy infants. So for the *Prosolytes* to claime the priviledges of the *Jewes* holy off-spring for his owne *Infants*, though borne of an unbeliever, was no sinne in him, nor contradiction of the new Covenant of God, but the effect of one and the selfe-same Covenant, he being commanded to circumcise them, even all his male *Infants*, in which you your selfe grant that the females were included in that time.

Now I conceive, that if any of the *Prosolytes* daughters at his entrance in, did refuse to come in, shee could not be compelled violently, but was still, as mee remained so to be esteemed without and numbered not amongst the living in *Jerusalem*, but the dead in *Palestina*. And therefore by the same rule, if any of his male children, (who were at yeares of discretion) would not be content to come in with his father, as his father was to reckon him among the uncircumcised, so was he not to circumcise him, nor compell him to be circumcised, till he submitted voluntarily; yet if this *Prosolyte* had male infants, borne of her that was sanctified to him, though he did not sanctifie him, he was to circumcise them, and to rank his

ly infants (both male and female) among the circumcised *Salemites*; and to put such a real difference between them and his disobedient children; as between *holy* and *profane*, as between *members of the Church*, and *not of the Church*; as between *circumcised Israelites*, and *uncircumcised Philistines*.

And so the holy Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 7. 14. teacheth all believers to esteem such Children *holy*; and directly opposite to those Children, whose unbelieving parents are not so much as sanctified to any believer, for procreating a *holy seed*: and therefore the *Infants* of one, or both believing parents, are to be esteemed *holy*; and it is a sinne to rank them with those infants, whose parents are not any one of them in Covenant with God, or at least so to be esteemed; for wee have nothing to doe with *secret things*, which belong only unto God; but things revealed wee are to look into, and so to judge of the tree by the fruit; and in doing thus, we shall not doe amisse, or commit sin, because we so judge, though things fall out afterward contrary to our former expectation, since those persons declare themselves otherwise then before they did; or that God discover them unto us to be otherwise, then wee were formerly to esteeme them.

But to this objection, * That they are here termed *holy*, and are so to be esteemed. You answer.

* Pag. 5. lin. 34
A. R.

* That so were the unbelieving *Jewes*, when they were broken off, Rom. 11. 16. and so is the unbelieving wife in this place; yet neither of these are to be baptized for their being termed *holy*; and therefore not Children for their being here termed *holy*.

* Pag. 5. lin. 36
37. 2.

To which I answer, that you doe not observe the scope of the Apostles words, for he would not have us to judge, that those are *holy* in *visibilitie*, who are *visibly Apostated*, and are cut off; for the Apostle speaking of the *Apostate Jewes*, sayth, *What shall their receiving be but life from the dead* *? For (sayth he) if the first fruits be *holy*, so is the whole lump; and if the root be *holy*, so are the branches *. Intimating, that those branches are *visibly holy*, which abide in the Vine, and Olive tree, and receive nourishment from, and are borne up of the root; And the Apostle declareth that those unbelieving *Jewes* were broken off, and were not then partaker of that benefit which the believing *Gentiles* had, by being grafted in (in stead of the *Jewes*) and so made partaker of the root and fatnesse of the Olive tree: yea, & further, the Apostle declareth the cause of the *Jewes* cutting off, namely, *unbelief*; Through *unbelief* they are broken off; and there-

* Ver. 15.

* Ver. 16.

Ver. 17.

Ver. 18.

Ver. 19.

Ver. 20.

Ver. 21.

Ver. 22.

Ver. 23.

fore he exhorteth the believing Gentiles not to be high-minded, but to feare; and to take heed, and to behold the bountifulnes, and severitie of God. Toward them which have fallen; Severitie; but (sayth he) towards the bountifulnes, if thou continue in his bountifulnes; or els thou shalt be cut off. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in. So then it appeareth that the Apostle doth teach us, that their abiding on the Olive tree, doth demonstrate them to be holy, (in the appearance of men.) Howbeit, those are holy, (in the sight of God) who shall be saved, though they are not known unto men to be) holy, but ought to be esteemed unholy in visibilitie. So the incestuous person of the Church of Corinth, (when he was cut off from them) was by the Church to be esteemed unholy, in visibilitie; but afterward, when he repented, he was then to be esteemed holy by those persons who formerly (and rightly according to visibilitie) esteemed him unholy, even at the time when he fell from his steadfastnesse. And so it is sayd, *that he that is left in mount Sion, and in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem: So it appeareth, that till we see them to be of the number of those, who are in mount Sion, and in Jerusalem, wee are not to esteeme them holy: What they are in Gods secret account, his sacred Majestie knoweth; but the revealed will of God hath directed us, not to call those visibly holy, who are visibly unholy, (as all visible unbelievers are,) nor are we to esteeme those unholy outwardly, who are outwardly holy (as all visible believers are) for the Apostle putteth a difference between branch and branch; between visible believers, and visible unbelievers; as we must doe between the members of the visible Church, and those that Apostatize from them, and are cut off.

But the holy children of believers (in their infancie) cannot justly be said to Apostatize from God, or to degenerate from that heavenly state, and holy olive tree, in which they are by faith ingrafted, and therefore well might the Apostle teach us, that we are to esteeme them holy.

Whereas you say, so is the unbelieving wife in this place.

I Ans. It is not so, The Apostle sayth not, that the unbelieving wife of the believer is holy, but sanctified, but he declareth that the children are holy.

And as for the baptizing of such branches (that are broken off before they are grafted in againe, or the unbelieving wife, before she be a believer) we plead not; but alledge the contrary; for they are not

* Isa. 4. 3.

not visibly holy, as you would inferre, but they are unholy in *visibilitie*, and are not to be esteemed as written among the *living in Jerusalem*, but as *dead in sins and trespasses*, till they repent, and beleeve, and live thereby; and so the *Apostle* sayth, *What shall the receiving of the unbelieving Jewes be, but life from the dead*; But so long as they are spiritually dead, they are not to be esteemed holy, nor reckoned among the *living in Jerusalem*. For as such unbelievers were not meet to be members of the *visible Church*, in the time of the *Law*, no more are they meet to be members of the *visible Church*, in the time of the *Gospel*; for as the *Church of God*, both was, and is a *spirituall holy Church*, so it hath refused (and doth and ought to refuse) all those persons that are not *living stones, holy, and spirituall*; for holinesse (sayth *David*) *becometh thine house, O Lord, for ever. Psal. 103. 5.*

Next, you rehearse a question, *What holinesse is here meant to the Children?*

To which you answer, *That it is not that holinesse that accompanieth faith: and such holinesse onely is available to the admittance into the state of the Gospel, and to have right to Baptisme.*

To which I answer, that it is to be taken for that holinesse that accompanieth faith, and therefore it is available to admit them into the state of the Gospel, and giveth them *visible right to Baptisme*; and this may appeare unto you from the *Apostles* testimony, which declareth that if one of the parents be a beleever, the children are holy, different from those *uncleane children* whose parents are neither holy, nor sanctified to the holy, to produce a *holy seed*; and therefore I conclude, that we are to account the *Infants of beleevers* to have that holinesse upon them, which accompanieth faith, and giveth them *visible right to Baptisme*; so they are to be judged to be of the number of *Gods elect*, as really, as those, are to be judged, who profess faith, and manifest obedience in their owne persons.

And it is further to be minded, that *visible Saints*, who make a *verball profession*, and walke *holily* in outward appearance, though we cannot infallibly tell whether they have faith or no, they are to be baptized, And we are not to dreame that wee can discern internally in men, seeing *God only knoweth the heart*, and no man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man that is in him; yet where we see a *holy verball profession*, and a *life and conversation annexed thereunto*, and correspondent therewith, outwardly, though the inward qualifications be not according to the requiring of the Word,

Rom. 11. 15.

* Rev. 22. 13.

Acts 8, 13.

* Ver. 21.

22.

23.

Note though Simon Magnus was in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquitie, yet he was sayd before to beleeve, and was baptized; And now since, Peter biddeth him repent, &c. Which shew, that Peter knew not when but that he might be saved.

Gal. 3. 7.

Gal. 4. 28.

Ver. 28, 29,

30, 31.

Rom. 4. 2, 4.

Mal. 3. 2, 3, 2.

Rom. 4. 6.

Gen. 17. 11.

Rom. 4. 11.

Phil. 2. 12.

yet wee are to judge them to have that *internall true holinesse*, without which no man shall see the Lord, and also that the Lord hath admitted them into the *fellowship* of his Son Jesus, and into the state of his Gospel, and that they are as *lively precious stones*, as living fruitfull plants, and therefore are to be accounted to have as much right to Baptisme, as he that manifesteth more holinesse. So it is said of Simon magus, that he also beleeved, and was baptized, and yet afterwards when he manifested *evill fruits*, Peter said unto him *, *Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter; for thine heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent, &c. for I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquitie.* And therefore we are to baptize those whom we are to judge to have holinesse internally, though in Gods sight they have it not; That is to say, Those that have holinesse outwardly, are to be admitted into the *outward visible state*, and are to have the *outward Baptisme*; they being to be judged to have the *inner graces*; as the *holy children of beleevers* have in *visibilitie*, and so are to be esteemed in the judgement of charitie; which thinketh no evil. But what is the reason why you thinke, that the holinesse ascribed by the Apostle to the children of beleevers, is not that holines that accompanieth faith; Is it because they cannot work? Is it so indeed? I tell you, that the Scripture teacheth us, that those that are of the faith, (though they cannot work) the same are the children of Abraham, and that the children of the promise are counted for the seed, and that Jack was a childe of promise in his infancie; And that faith and works are different things; And therefore though the *holy children of beleevers* cannot work, yet the Lord imputeth righteousness unto them without works; And yet we are to minde, that the Lord would not have his people to cease from working and to be idle, so long as they are able to worke. But when they have neither will, skill, nor ability, (as many a visible Saint that is in years may want, and yet be no Covenant-breaker) then the Lord accepteth of them, and imputeth his righteousness unto them, as if they had done all the *holy works* which ever were done in the world, by any, who were imputed righteousness. God is a wise God, and knoweth that his Saints can doe nothing without him, nor act further then they have capability, therefore in his mercie he exacteth no more. God in his wisdom knew that the *Infants of beleevers* were capable of *passive Ordinances*, and therefore he instituted the same to be imposed upon them, and admitted unto them; But as for *active ordinances* which they could

could not performe, nor had naturall capabilitie to doe, God did not require it at their hands, no more then he did require the Proselytes females to be circumcised, who (as you say) were impled in the males. And this doth in no way eclipse the Glorie of Christs mediatorskip, but advanceth the free Grace of God, and the righteousness of Christ, far above all the works in the world. But to affirme that the infants of beleevers have not the true holines, w^{ch} accompanieth faith, is (in a manner) to darken the Glorious Sunne of Righteousnesse, and the light of his Gospel, with a meritorious smoake of corrupt doctrine, arising out of the bottomlesse pit of sorie mans deceptull hearts.

But let us heare what you say further for confirmation of your affirmation.

True it is, that in the time of the Law, and state of the Jewes, and old Covenant, there were some fiderally, and outwardly holy, and outwardly uncleane, and then all men, yea, all things in the world, were distinguished by this kinde of holinesse: So the uncircumcised were then unholy, and they of the Circumcision holy, and might not accompanie with the other, Act. 11. 3. And accordingly had they their outward washings and purifications, for these their outward pollutions: all which were but typicall things, and all these and such like distinctions are now abolished with that State, and quite taken away out of the world by the comming of Christ; and this is evident by Peters vision, Act. 10. 11. &c. expounded by himselfe in the 28. verse, where he sayth, That God had shewed him, that he should not call any man polluted or uncleane: Whence it is cleare, that now all men in the world are as cleane as the Circumcised, and those as polluted in the Gospel-sense as any other; for now all are as one and alike in Christ Iesus, as may appeare by these Texts, Rom. 10. 11. Col. 3. 11. Gal. 3. 28. &c. 5. 6. And as none then without this legall and outward holinesse, ought to partake of those legall performances and worship, nor be admitted thereunto, without being first circumcised in the flesh, and so made legally holy, Exod. 12. 48. So now none are acceptable, or ought to partake of the Gospel, worship and ordinances, without the Circumcision of Christ, which is of the heart and spirit, Col. 2. 11. Rom. 2. 28, 29. And this inward spirituall truth, was typified by that outward fleshly shadow: Hence therefore I will conclude, that the Apostle meant no such kinde of holinesse in this place, for the beleevers children to have. Nor is there any such kinde of holinesse now in the world amongst men, nor is this or any other kinde of holinesse (save onely that true holinesse that accompanies the new creature) available to Baptisme.

A. R.
Pag. 6. lin. 5.

To which I Answer. All this which you have said here, maketh nothing against the *infants of beleeving parents*, forasmuch as they are declared to be *holy* now under the Gospel. 1 Cor. 7. 14.

The cessation of the *ceremonies* of the old law, pleadeth their *own* right to whatsoever came in stead thereof, considering that Christ came not to impoverish them, but to enrich them; If he took away any ordinance from them, which was *typicall*, he left that which is *substantiall*; And the like we may say, concerning the outward holinesse ceremoniall, which had still relation to the covenant and Church of God; which if it were taken from them, shall we thinke they were left so naked, and bare, that they had not as substantiall holinesse, as they had before; God doth not doe by *holy* men as theeves do by honest men; even strip them of their ornaments, and so leave them to shift for themselves, and get other what they can. But our heavenly Father, careth for all his children in speciall manner, both for great and small, for young as well as old. He taketh nothing from them, which he knoweth is profitable to them, or beneficiall for them; but giveth them as great, if not greater in stead thereof; If he know they have a *necessitie* of it, it is his will and pleasure they should not be debarred from it. And therefore seeing *baptisme* is come in stead of *circumcision*; as *holy infants* then were to be *circumcised*, so *holy infants* are now to be *baptised*. And as God declared unto *Abraham*, saying, that such *infants* *needs* be *circumcised*; so we may know (that *baptisme* being come in the roome of *circumcision*) such *infants* must needs be *baptised*. And therefore as *holy infants* then had need of a *Saviour* to come, and therefore were *circumcised*, in token that *Christ* was theirs; so *holy infants* now have need of *Christ* come, and therefore are to be *baptised* in token that *Christ* is theirs also.

And may the *circumcised* accompanie now with the *uncircumcised*; yea surely; and this is a great plea for *holy infants* being in covenant, and doth really signifie, that it is a *visible spirituall holinesse* which differenceth them now from *heathen infants*; considering that God never taketh from his people any thing which differenceth them from other people, but he leaveth them the substance of that type which substance doth difference them *spiritually* now; Therefore the Lord calleth his people (now under the Gospel) to come out from among the *Idolatrous heathens*, and to separate themselves, and not to touch the *uncleane thing*, and promiseth that he will be a Father unto

* Gen. 17. 13.

* 1 Cor. 6. 17, 18.

unto them, and that they shall be his sons and daughters; That is to say, that as he was a father to the families of the Jewes, who were separated from strangers, so likewise is he a Father to the families of the separated Gentiles, who obey his voyce; and as God did graciously accept of the infants of beleevers, who were separated from Idolaters then; so doth he accept of the infants of beleevers, who are separated from Idolaters now; I will, saith he, be a father unto you. Now he that is a father to the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the house of Judah, he beareth the holy off-spring, & the blessed Issues; even all the glorious vessels of small quantitie. Despise not therefore the infants of beleevers, for though in quantitie they are small, yet in quality they are excellent, therefore suffer the little infants to come unto Christ, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdome of Heaven. And therefore considering that they have that holinesse, which accompanieth faith, and are in the state of the Gospel, they have right to baptisme, as the holy infants of the Jewes (in the time of the law) had right to circumcision.

And true it is that in the time of the Law, there were some outwardly holy. But they were members of the Church; And it doth not argue, that (because they had ceremoniall holinesse) therefore they were not spirituall in visibilitie; the contrary rather appeareth from what hath been before observed. Againe, you should consider, that there were some who were spiritually cleane, and yet in respect of bodily diseases were unclean; for we are not to thinke that every one that were defiled in their bodies, by touching of dead folks, or unclean persons, that had issues, or leprosie, (or the like) were therefore defiled in their soules, or rent thereby out of the Covenant, or that they ceased therefore to be visible members of the Church: No surely; But yet we are to know, that those who did any of these things presumptuously were guilty, so that nothing could purifie them without repentance, yea, when any sinned but ignorantly, & knowing it, neglected to bring their trespass offering, their sin was increased, & they were to beare their iniquitie, for remission whereof, more was required then before; yea, if a person were outwardly polluted accidentally (though he did not defile himselfe by any act of his,) he was to be cleansed according to the law of God, which thing if he did not endeavour to doe, it was his sinne, and surely it could not then be taken away by any outward washing, without repentance, and labouring to doe that which he should have done before; which ceremoniall cleansings and purifications,

* Isa. 22. 11.

* Ver. 24.

Luk 18. 16.

* This is to be understood of a ceremoniall holinesse, for the members of the visible Church now, are outwardly holy (that is to say) in visibilitie, without which wee ought not to esteeme them holy inwardly.

* Lev. 5. 3, 4, 5.

* Lev. 4. & 5. & 6.

* Lev. 14. 8.

See Lev. 17. 16

tions, were to lead them to *Christ*, who was then to be manifested in the *flesh*, and a *Saviour* to save them from their *sinnes*, which the *bloud of bulls*, and *goats*, and *outward washings* could not doe a way*; no more then the *outward Baptisme*, and the *Lords Supper* (*Gods holy and blessed Ordinances*) will take away our *sinnes* now; for *Christs bloud* is onely effectually for this purpose*; he is the *Lamb of God* which taketh away the *sinnes of the world*. *Joh. 1. 29.*

But our chiefe poynt is not here about *ceremoniall circumstantiall shadowes*; for we all grant, that the *ceremonies of the old law* are ceased.

And to argue that (because they were then subject to *legall pollution*, and some of them had it,) that therefore they had not the *inward and spirituall cleanness*, is a vaine and groundlesse thing to thinke; for the *Good Lord* was mercifull unto every one that prepared his heart to seek the *Lord*, the *Lord God of his Fathers*, though they were not cleansed according to the purification of the *Sanctuary*;* that though he had not that *outward purification* which you speak of.

And their purifications and washings (w^h you mention*) they were to teach them the benefit w^h they had and were to have *spiritually* by *Iesus Christ*. Their *circumcision of the flesh** also, was to teach them the *Circumcision of the heart**; all which *circumstantiall Ordinances*, though they are ceased, yet we have the *substance* of them in other *Ordinances*, and that *outwardly*.

And further, it is to be minded (concerning the people of *Israel*) that their *conformitie* unto the *Lawes of God*, did really demonstrate unto men, that they were *spiritually holy*; and so now the *conformitie of Gods people*, to the *Lawes of God*, doth give sufficient demonstration of their *holinesse* in the sight of men, whereby they are judged them to be communicable persons in a *spirituall way*.

And though the *uncircumcised* were then *unholy*, (as you speak) yet they were such *uncircumcised*, who were not to be judged *circumcised* in their hearts; and though persons then were *circumcised* both in *heart*, and *flesh*, and did yeeld *universall obedience* to *Gods commands*, yet through some accident they might have a kinde of *ceremoniall defilement*, and yet retaineth their *visible holinesse* still.

You should also mind, that the people of *Israel* (after the *Law* was given in *Mount Sinai*) many of them, were *uncircumcised* in *flesh*; yet they were (at the time of their *uncircumcision*) a *holy, peculiar people* unto *God*, and none were like unto them*, and therefore your acknowledging that there was a difference between the *circumcised*, and the

* Heb. 10. 4.

* Rev. 2. 5.

Heb. 10. 5.

& 8. 14.

* 2 Chro. 30.

18, 19.

They had not time to purifie themselves, yet they did eat of the *Passeover*.

* Pag. 6. lin. 11.

* Gen. 17. 10,

11.

Rom. 4. 11.

* Deut. 10. 16.

* Pag. 6. lin. 9.

See Lev. 14. 8.

* Josh. 5. 5.

* Deut. 7. 6.

& 26. 18, 19.

& 33. 29.

the *uncircumcised*, and that the *circumcised* Israelites might not then companie with the *uncircumcised* Heathens, is of no force against this truth, even, that the *Infants* of *beleevers* have that holinesse which accompanieth faith; for though *circumcised* persons were not to accompany with the *uncircumcised*, yet it was meant of those *uncircumcised* persons, who were aliens from the common-wealth of Israel, and strangers from the Covenants of promise; and not of those who were then members of the Church of God; and therefore it was not meant of all *uncircumcised* persons; for then the parents should not have kept company with their *Infants*, before they were *circumcised*, but were to deliver them to other *uncircumcised* persons, to keep till the eighth day, wherein they were *circumcised*; And then the *uncircumcised* beleeving Gentiles were not to be *circumcised*, by the *circumcised*, but by the *uncircumcised*: Which to dreame, is meere foolishnesse; and therefore it appeareth that your Collections have no footing against holy infants.

To the poynt then; Seeing that the *Infants* of *beleevers*, though *uncircumcised*, might be accompanied with (in the time of their *uncircumcision*) and that by the *circumcised*: It evidently sheweth, that there was a great difference between them, and the heathen *Infants* of *uncircumcised* unbelievers. And seeing the *uncircumcised* infants of *beleevers*, might be lawfully accompanied with, and were different then from *unbelievers*, it is apparēt that they were holy then, though *uncircumcised*. And seeing that *beleevers* infants (though *uncircumcised*) were holy in the time of the Law, and distinguished by their holinesse from the *Infants* of *unbelievers*; and seeing that *Jesus Christ* is still one, and the same; and that the ceremonial holines is ceased; it plainly argueth, that when the *Apostle Paul* maketh (in 1 Cor. 7. 14.) of the holy children of *beleevers*, had by a sanctified wife; he meaneth such a holines which is not ceased, but remaineth permanent, and doth visibly demonstrate those persons who have it, to have right to Baptisme.

And as *Circumcision* did not give faith to the *Infants* of the Church, nor adde the *Infants* of the Church to the Church, (no more then any other person) but rather confirme them in it. So Baptisme now, doth not bring regeneration (or faith) unto such, (or unto any other persons) as many fondly imagine, neither doth it adde them to the Church, but rather confirme them therein.

Some *uncircumcised* persons might be accompanied with, and some *Circumcised* persons might not be accompanied with.

Pag. 6. lin. 15.

Touching Peters vision, which you mention *, that God shew'd him, that he should not call any man polluted or unclean.

It is good to understand in what sense it is spoken; for wee may rightly call all the visible members of Antichrist polluted, let them be what they will be, high or low, great or small; though they have, and usurpe the ordinances of God, yet they are polluted persons so long as they remaine in that estate; (even as the Apostates in the time of the Law, though they usurped circumcision, and other Ordinances, yet they were polluted persons) and these remaining in that sinfull estate they are not cleane, neither legally nor evangelically.

* Lin. 8.

To your inference *, (from Act. 10. 13.) I answer, That in the Gospel sense, those that are separated from Idolatry, and those that are Idolaters, are not all one in Christ Jesus; for how can any be sayd to be in Christ, so long as they are visibly out of Christ? Wherefore it is to be understood, that as the wicked, of whatsoever Nation, degree, or sex they be, are all one out of Christ; so, on the contrary, the Saints of God, of whatsoever Nation, degree, or sex they be, are all one in Christ, Rom. 10. 11. 12. 13. Gal. 3. 28. & 5. 6.

Rom. 2. 8, 9.
Rev. 21. 15.

And this sheweth us to put a visible distinction between those who are visibly holy, and those that are not. But the infants of believers, are visibly holy (as hath been proved before) and therefore wee are to judge them in Christ, and one with him, members of his mystical body, and different from those who are not visibly holy, but are out of the Covenant.

* Pag. 6. li. 25,
26, 27.

Whereas you say *, that so now none are acceptable, or ought to partake of the Gospel, worship, and ordinances, without the Circumcision of Christ, which is of the heart and Spirit.

I answer, That one ought to be baptised, before they are circumcised, or washed spiritually in the heart, (at least so far as may be discerned by men) neither ought any to presume without the inward, and outward Baptisme, to lay hands upon the rest of the institutions of God, which properly and peculiarly are tyed to the Church. And the Proselytes, or believing Gentiles in the time of the Law, before they were circumcised in the flesh, they were to be circumcised in their hearts; and before they did partake of the Passover (a figure of Christs body) they and their holy seed were to be circumcised in flesh, as well as in heart; which participation in the Ordinance then, was not to be limited onely to the outward fleshy shadow, no more then our partaking of Baptisme, or the Lords Supper

* Exod. 12. 48.

now, ought to be onely limited to the outward elements, of Water, Bread, and Wine. But as for the Infants of beleevers, they ought to be judged to have the circumcision of Christ, which is of the heart and Spirit, (as hath been formerly proved, and shall be further shewed,) and therefore it is apparent, that they are acceptable, and may lawfully have the Ordinance of Baptisme imposed upon them; for they being proved to be members of the visible Church of Christ, it appeareth, that they are to be judged in Christ, and new creatures, and that therefore the true holinesse accompanieth them. And this being so, what then will follow, but that according to your owne confession, they have right to Baptisme.

Further you say; If it be objected, that in respect of Justification, it availeth nothing, but to Baptisme it may.

To this you Answer, That that which availeth to Justification and salvation, doth according to the Rule, onely availe to Baptisme; for if thou beleevest with all thy heart, thou art justified, Act. 13. 39. and shalt be saved, Act. 16. 31. and mayest be baptized upon the same, and no other grounds, Act. 8. 37.

To which I Answer; As is the objection, so is your answer, without distinction: for there is a difference between justification in the sight of God, and justification in the sight of men; All those persons who are outwardly holy, may be justified in the sight and apprehension of men, & ought to be baptized upon this ground, though their heart (knowne onely to God) be (like the heart of Simon Magus) not upright in the sight of God. But the holy Word of God, is our Rule whereby we are to judge both beleevers and their infants (now under the Gospel) to be in covenant, regenerated, sanctified, and adopted unto God; the children of the promise in their infancie (as the infants of beleevers were in former time.) And upon this very ground, the Infants of beleevers now may lawfully be baptized, as the infants of beleevers (who were members of the Church in the time of the Law) were lawfully circumcised.

To the objection, That all that were baptized by the Apostles themselves, were not saved, &c. You answer.

And say *you doe grant, that all baptized by the Apostles were not saved, and yet deny the consequence, by distinguishing between the rule, by which they are to be baptized, (which is infallible) and the judgements of men, who are failable, and may be deceived in applying this rule; but it follows not, but that the rule being of God, is still as infallible as God him-

Pag. 6. lin. 37.

Lin. 37. to
Pag. 7.

By the Word
persons must
be justified,
and by the
Word they
must be con-
demned.

* Pag. 7. lin. 1.

* Lin. 3. to
lin. 25.

selfe is; for all that beleeve, shall be saved (which is true as God himselfe is true) yet all who are judged by beleevers to beleeve, doe not beleeve, and therefore are not saved. This failing then here is not in the rule, but in their judgements, who are but men, and can judge onely in the outward appearance, (by their fruits yee shall know them) Mat. 7. 16. And cannot judge as God, who onely knoweth the heart, 1 Sam. 16. 17. Jer. 17. 10.

Ans. Though this by construction, may be without contradiction, yet it may have a little further explanation, thus:

That though the Saints doe judge by the infallible rule, concerning persons, yet if they alter their judgement, according as the persons alter, they sinne not in the alteration of their opinion, because the infallible rule doth still guide their judgements: As for instance:

The infallible rule, doth direct our judgements to looke upon all the members of the visible Church, to be in the state of salvation; So the Disciples of Christ esteemed highly of Judas, as indeed the infallible rule directed them; but when once he discovered himselfe not to be that in effect, which before he was in appearance, then they were directed by the infallible rule, to alter their judgements without faile.

Further: In stead of these words; Yet all who are judged by beleevers to beleeve, doe not beleeve; It may be construed thus; That all who are rightly judged (or ought to be judged) by beleevers to beleeve, doe not beleeve; For there is a difference, between what persons doe, and what they should, or ought to doe. And persons judging as they ought, though their judgement is alterable, yet as the Rule is not faileable, neither is their judgement by it sinfull; but righteous, holy, just, and lawfull judgement.

This being construed thus, and so taken, I assent thereunto.

But as for your following inference, I abhorre, and detest from my very soule.

Your words are these:

* But in the baptizing of infants, the case is far otherwise, yea, quite contrary, who will or can faile in judging an infant to be an infant; the failing therefore here is in the Rule it selfe, and so the fault and sinne in the appointer of such a deceivable Rule: This therefore cannot be of God, who is truth it selfe, but must be of man; For let God be true, and every man a lyar. And when doth he shew himselfe more vainly to be so, then when he goeth about to set his posts by Gods posts; and when he teacheth for doctrine, his owne vaine and lying traditions, such as this is.

Answer.

To judge of persons according to the infallible Rule, is righteous judgement; in which the judgers must lay aside all partialitie.

A. R.
* Pag. 7. li. 15.
10 lin. 25.

Ans. Groundlesse positions and false inferences therefrom, are frequent with you; your words import, that in the baptizing of infants, because none can faile in judging an infant to be an infant, that therefore the sayling is in the Rule it selfe; and therefore you conclude, it cannot be of God, but of man, a vaine tradition!

The like might be sayd of the Circumcision of infants, in the time of the Law, that because they could not faile in their judgements, in judging infants to be infants, that therefore the circumcision of infants was not of God, but of man, a vaine tradition! and the rule was not infallible!

But you may know, that for beleevers to impose the signe * and seal * of the righteousness of faith, upon their children (in their infancy) was good, lawfull, & warrantable *, directed by the infallible rule of Gods Word; which rule was never yet abrogated; therefore it standeth in force, and is not a vaine tradition; and seeing God himselfe administred Baptisme upon infants, before the Law was given in Mount Sinai; how dare you say, it is not of God?

Next after this, you cast your eye upon an Author, whom you * call, A learned and able Author of our times; whose expression (you say) you cannot but take notice of.

Ans. It may be, you call him learned, and able, because (as you say) he confesseth himselfe unconvinced of the lawfulness of the Baptisme of infants, by demonstration of Scripture for it. And yet he taketh the Baptisme of infants to be one of the most reverend, generall, and uncontrouled traditions which the Church hath, and which he would no lesse doubt of, then the Creed to be Apostolicall.

And upon this beliefe and confession of his, you Paraphrase *, saying, No more would I doubt thereof, if I could be convinced by any demonstration of Scripture for it: But seeing demonstration of Scripture, neither to us is, nor by him can be produced for it, I doe and must remaine still unconvinced with him, and must needs take it to be a meere humane device.

To which I answer, That the doubting conscience cannot be satisfied, unlesse God doe it by his Word, or Spirit, but if the Lord doe open your eyes, and give you sight to apprehend, and comprehend this light, then in it you shall see clearly this truth, even the lawfulness of the Baptisme of holy infants. But if God doe not by his Spirit open your heart, the tongue of men and Angels cannot convince you, but you must still remaine unconvinced. But how can you expect

* Gen. 17. 11.

* Rom. 4. 11.

* Exod. 12. 48.

Baptisme is to us as Circumcision was to the Jewes.

A. R.

* See Pag. 7. lin. 25, 26.

* In lin. 31. to Pag. 8.

that this *Author* (whom you call *Mr. Daniel Rogers*) should produce Scripture for the *Baptisme of Infants*, while he is (as he saith himself) unconvinced of it by demonstration of Scripture, except you did expect that he should have played the *hypocrite*, & so have gone against his *Conscience*; you should know, that *Whatsoever is not of faith is sin*.

And it doth not argue (as you infer) that (because no demonstration of Scripture is brought by him) that therefore none at all is brought to you, by those who are convinced of it by the authority of Scripture. This cannot be true which you affirme, considering the many Scriptures which you acknowledge have been alledged for to prove the *Baptisme of infants*; The demonstration whereof hath been sufficiently shewed unto you, and therefore if you take it not for satisfaction, you may remaine unsatisfied, and still unconvinced, (though convicted) with your alledged *Author*, and take it (or rather mistake it) (as you esteem it) for a meere humane device.

But further you say;

Nor is this *Author* alone, in deeming the *Baptisme of infants* a tradition, for many of the *Ancients* with him have so declared it.

Origen calleth it a Ceremony or Tradition of the Church. In *Leviticus* hom. 8. in *Epist. ad Rom.* lib. 5.

Augustine calleth it a Common Custome of the Church. *De baptismo contra Dona.* lib. 4. cap. 23. *Et de Genesi ad literam.* lib. 10. cap. 23.

To which, I say, that things may be traditionall, and common, and customarily practised, and yet have sufficient ground and warrant in the Scripture.

But in citing *Origen*, you doe not tell us, what he sayth in the same *Epistle*, (to wit) that the Church received *Baptisme of infants* from the *Apostles*.

And in citing *Augustine*, you doe not declare what he sayth (*contra Donatist.* lib. 4. cap. 23, 24.) that the *Baptisme of Infants* was not derived from the authority of man, or Counsels, but from the tradition or doctrine of the *Apostles*.

But next of all you say, *Erasmus* *, lib. 4. de *Ratione Concilio*, sayeth that they are not to be condemned that doubt whether *Childrens Baptisme* were ordained by the *Apostles*, &c.

To which I answer; No more will I condemne those who weaknesse doe doubt of the *Baptisme of Infants*, but rather pity them, and pray for them, and labour, (as the *Apostle* biddeth) concerning

A. R.
Pag. 8.

Origen.

Augustine.

* Lin. 9.

concerning those that are fallen through infirmities) To restore them with the spirit of meeknesse. But when their sinne cometh to such a height, that they resist the truth, and run on wilfully, and blasphemously, with a leoprous headines, and that against the Scripture, and the very light, and law of reason, and will not heare good Counsell, nor receive wholesome instruction; then they are not to be borne with, but condemned.

Whereas you say further, that *Ekins** calleth (the Baptisme of Infants) a Commandement and ordinance of man; In Echiridion.

I answer, You should know, that it is a Commandement, and ordinance of God, In the Scripture.

Whereas you produce the *Papists**, and the *Authoritie of Counsell** (to jump with you, and your first learned Author, cited by you, against the Baptisme of Infants,) to prove it not to be warranted in the Word, but grounded upon tradition, and not upon the Scripture.

I answer; It evidently appeareth, that these your erroneous conceptions, and peremptory conclusions, are builded upon a sandy foundation. I pray you, tell me; How can they beleeve a thing by Scripture, that judge the Fathers above the Scripture?

And as you thus bring humane insufficient Testimony, to prove the Baptisme of Infants, to be a humane invention; so you doe the like in labouring to make knowne the time when it was invented, a meere dreame! and vaine conceits of your owne! a thing farre above your reach! And you would by your humane Authors, beate your Auditors in hand, as if the Baptisme of infants, were invented some hundreds of yeares after Christ; which is neither certaine, probable, nor possible; and yet you cite other humane Authors for it, whose historicall relations (as you have set them downe) have no bottom upon truth, and therefore are to no purpose against the Baptisme of holy Infants. And therefore your citing them, maketh nothing for your purpose neither. But you ought rather in this to mount above humane testimony, and leave these your two cited Authors to reconcile themselves;) Goe to the Law, and to the Testimony, (for whatsoever is not according to that, hath no light in it) and there see what time the baptisme of infants was administered. As for the time of the invention thereof, I will not intermeddle, nor take upon me to determine at this time; forasmuch as it is sufficient for us to know, that God is the Author and institutor of it; the administration whereof was in the Cloud, and in the Sea, not long after the Israelites came out of the Land of Egypt. But it was before the Law was given

The obstinate, though ignorant, are to be rejected, when they reject the truth.

* Lin. 12.

* Lin. 15.

* Lin. 23.

* Isa. 8. 29.

I thinke that Circumcision of infants was not invented, nor administred before the Baptisme of infants.

1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.

*Pag. 8. lin. 37.

*Pag. 9. li. 1, 2.

Rev. 22. 19.

1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.

1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.

given in Mount Sinai, many hundred yeares before *Iesus Christ* was manifested in the flesh; and therefore your new account is too shon a weapon to undermine Gods holy administration of Baptisme upon his Redeemed ones; Such as the *Israelites* were, whom he brought out of the Land of *Egypt*, and baptised in the Cloud, and in the Sea.

Further, you cite more humane Authors, (to speak your pleasure against the baptisme of infants, as if it were thrust upon the world under colour, and pretence; foisted in (say you) like all other Antichristian devices, have their cloakes and holy pretences.)

I answer; These are rude words, and words that wee may rather admire at, then imbrace, considering what little ground you have to speake them, and how violently you have wringed them from humane testimony, builded also upon mistakings of humane Authors. Have you no more feare of God in you, then upon such sleight grounds, so publickly to breake out, and that in such unseemly tearmes, against the Baptisme of Infants, Gods holy and blessed Ordinance? Now surely, you are not to be justified, but condemned for your presuming thus to affirme, what you cannot prove; and labouring sacrilegiously to take away the visible badge of Christianity from Christian Infants. Consider what a dangerous thing it is to diminish from Gods Word; He that taketh away therefrom, God shall take away his part out of the booke of life, &c. And with this consider also what ground you have had, for your evill persuasion, unjust calumination, and sinfull affirmation. You should know, that the Baptisme of Infants was not brought into the world by man, much lesse was thrust upon the world, under colour, and pretence, and Antichristian-like, foisted in, (as you unjustly affirme) but God in his love, and mercy, and bountifull liberallitie, brought it into the world, amongst other priviledges; for his Elects sake, & did not thrust it upō the world (as you speake) but ordained it in an orderly way, to be imposed upon his Church and People; whose visible holinesse gave them right unto it; And he did not bring it under colour, and pretence, as the *Antibaptists* doe their Baptisme, in administering Baptisme upon People, and then telling them, it is right, and afterward that it is wrong, (and that they must therefore be baptized againe, by them in another manner,) and so after they have been baptized by them againe and againe, they after a while are restless againe and unsatisfied, because he who baptized them, was unbaptized himselfe upon their own grounds. Nor can they beleve there is any baptiz

rightly

rightly in the world. And so they know not upon their owne grounds, what to doe, or how to practise any Ordinance of the New Testament.

These their Baptismes (I may say) are rather to be accounted as thrustings, colourable pretences, and foystings, (and the like,) then the Baptisme of holy Infants, which was brought into the world by the Wonderfull Counseller, whose mightie power is to be magnified in all his noble acts; who saved Noah and his familie in the Arke, (when all the world of unbelievers, both yong & old, perished with the Flood^a;) Which figure answereth the baptism that now is^b; who baptized the Children of Israel in the Cloud, and in the Sea^c; When Pharoah and his Host were overwhelmed with the mighty waters^d; who (according to his blessed promise^e, made unto his People) sent his blessed Sonne Jesus Christ, (our Emanuel^{*}) into the world, to beare our sinnes, and to suffer death for us, and put an end to our iniquities; Who was buried, and rose againe the third day, according to the Scriptures^f; And at his Ascension into the bosome of his blessed Father, he gave Commission to his Disciples, to teach all Nations^g, and to preach the Gospel to every creature^h; and to baptize those who were to be esteemed in the state of salvation; Who (when his earthly tabernacle dwelt amongst us) declared that the kingdome of heaven consisteth of such holy infants^k, for whom he prayed earnestlyⁱ, upō whom he layd his own holy hands^k, pronouncing them blessed with his owne mouth^l. Wherefore you shew your selfe very ignorant, and exceeding presumptuous, that dare (with open face in the view of the world,) so far to deny Christ, (in a manner,) as to say that his Ordinance of Baptisme, (administred upon holy Infants,) is such a thing, which (by a supposed helpe of fraile man) you have declared it to be.

Consider further, how that although all these Antient Fathers whom you have cited, were on your side. And though you should cite many more, in Antiquitie far surpassing the other, yet all is vaine w^{ch} you doe, yea, properly vanitie without the Scripture, and as it is to no edification, so it will give no satisfaction, or information to the doubting soul, or make any thing for strengthening your error; (though it may harden you and other seduced in it) but it will be a means rather to adde griefe, and vexation to your spirit, at the day when you must give up your account, for all your idle words, vaine actions, & hard speeches, when it will be little available to fly to these

a Gen. 7.

b 1 Pet. 3. 20, 21.

c 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.

d Exod. 14. 28.

e Deut. 18. 15.

* Mat. 1. 8 & 2.

f 1 Cor. 15. 4.

g Mat. 28. 19.

h Mar. 16. 15, 16.

* Luke 18. 17.

i Joh. 17. 20, 21, 24.

k Mat. 19. 15.

l Mar. 10. 16.

these mountaines to hide you from the wrath of the Lambe ; whose word shall judge these fathers whom you have cited, by which they shall be justified or condemned ; when they shall not judge it, or condemn it, (as Hereticks formerly have done,) but be judged by it.

I have not told you that *Auxertius*, (one of the *Arians* Sectaries, with his adherents, (who denied the persons in the blessed Trinity, and denied the Godhead of *Jesus Christ*), was one of the first that denied the baptism of Infants.

And that *Pelagius* the Hereticke was a patron of this opinion of yours. Whom *Augustine* and others of the *Antient Fathers*, have opposed by the *Scriptures*, and condemned for heresie, as justly they might ; for then it may be you would say, that *Augustine* was an Hereticke himselfe as well as the rest, and therefore the citing of him (or any such as he was) can make nothing for our present purpose, in clearing the case in controversy ; for indeed, after this manner, did *Mr. Smith* (the *Anabaptist*), answer *Mr. Clifton*, who was his opposite and overthrew his errors.

But indeed I desire that all things may be tryed by the touchstone of the Word of God, which is the onely rule for every divine action, which directeth us to hold fast that which is good, and to judge of persons and causes accordingly.

Therefore I desire that what hath bin spoken already in answer to your severall objections, and what hath been also gathered from the word of truth, in vindication of this truth, of the baptism of holy Infants) may be observed.

It hath been declared how the promise is made to all beleevers Infants, as really, as to themselves, or any of their children *.

It hath been proved, that the generall institution of *Jesus Christ*, is no maner of way lesse generall * then circumcision, but more generall, in respect of the parties upon whom it is to be administred.

It hath been minded *, how that the Infants of beleevers were holy, & members of the visible Church in the time of the Law, and that neither the cessation of the ceremonies of the old Law, nor any thing else, which can be alledged, doth argue that they have not still the true holinesse which giveth them visible right to Baptisme. But seeing the dispensation of Gods gifts, and the distribution of his graces, are multiplyed under the Gospel, wee are still to esteem the young Olive plants of beleeving parents to be holy, as well as the stock or branches upon which they grow. And it being so, we may conclude, that they

* See before
in Pag. 3. to
Pag. 15.

* Pag. 15. to
pag. 24.

* Pag. 24. to
pag. 64.

they have right to holy Baptisme, as their holy parents have. And to debar the holy infants of beleivers from Baptisme, is to reject them, and so (in a manner) it is a rejection of their holy parents ; a means of their discouragement ; a weakning of their faith ; a discomforting of their hearts ; yea, and discouragement to others.

But Truth overcommeth all things, it is great, and will prevaile against all that oppose it.

Thus having answered directly to what hath been set downe by you, I proceed to the next.

Your next words are these :

But now to the Question ; What is meant by the holinesse which children are sayd to have, 1 Cor. 7. 14. In answer whereto, I shall shew onely what I conceive it to be, and then leave it to the judgement of the wise.

Answer. If you mean the holy children of beleoving parents, (spoken of 1 Cor. 7. 14.) Let us heare what you say.

I say then it is onely such a holinesse, as is opposite to some kinde of uncleannesse, which I take to be this, as if when they are sayd to be holy, it is no more then to say, they are not uncleane, (to wit) no Bastards.

To which I answer ; That you are greatly mistaken herein, There is no such restriction in the Scripture, as you conceive, and would gather from thence ; for it is apparent, that when the Apostle sayth to Beleivers (1 Cor. 7. 14.) Else were your children uncleane ; he meaneth here such an uncleannesse, which he speaketh of in 2 Cor. 6. 17. Which uncleannesse, the Saints are bidden not to touch ; I will dwell in them, and walke in them ; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from amongst them, and be yee separated, sayth the Lord, and touch not the [uncleane] thing, And I will be a father unto you, and yee shall be my sonnes and daughters, sayth the Lord God Almighty.

Observe here, how that this uncleannesse is directly opposed to the holinesse which those have who are in covenant with God ; who alwayes did put a difference between the holy and prophane, between the infants of the world, and the infants of the Church. And so the Apostle (speaking in the Scripture language,) calleth the children of Beleivers holy : Else were your children uncleane, (saith he,) but now are they holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14. Else were your children bastards (say you) but now are they no bastards. This, you conceive, is the meaning of that Scripture : But you should minde, that the Profelytes in the time of the Law, and the beleiving parents in the time of the Gospel,

A. R.
Pag. 9. lin. 21.

A. R.
Lin. 25.

2 Cor. 6.
Ver. 16.
Ver. 17.
Ver. 18.

The Apostle speaketh to the same people, useth the same Scripture-phraze, in applying the precious promises. And doth in no way exclude, but include their posteritie. For confirmation whereof, see the practise of Peter in Act. 2. 39.

Heb. 13. 4.

who were formerly *unbelievers*, were not all *bastards* : and *legitimacy* is not a thing peculiar to *believers*, but *unbelievers* may have it. But when the *Apostle* speaketh of a *holinesse*, which the *children of believers* have, it is that which is peculiar unto the *Saints of God*, and not common to *Infidells*, who are without *God* in the world, and not to be communicated with.

You should minde, that the *Apostle* speaketh in the heavenly language of *Canaan*, in the *Scriptures* ordinary phrase ; giving the *believers infants* such a *stile*, w^{ch} the *holy Spirit of God* hath given them ; (according as it is plentifully manifested in the *Scriptures of God*), and which he hath not given and granted unto *unbelievers infants*. There is no place of *Scripture*, which declareth them to be *holy* : Wherefore wee may conclude, that there is a great deale of difference between the *infants of believers*, and the *infants of unbelievers*, and that the *uncleannesse* of the one, is opposed to the *holines* of the other, as *darknesse*, is opposed unto *light*. As *Idolaters*, are (sayd to be) opposed to those that are *seperated* from them *. And so the *Jewes* (*seperated* from *Idolaters*) were all *holy*, both *young* and *old*, and *Gods* *seperated* peculiar people * ; The *Lord* was their *God*, and they were his *people*, and he dwelt in the midst of them *, and *sanctified* them unto himselfe *, and gave unto them his *blessed Ordinances* *, and *holy Ordinances* : yea, and the *Gentiles* also, who had like *precious faith* with the *Jewes*, were then made *partakers* of the like *precious priviledges* with them ; which extended unto their *infants* *, as well as to the *infants of the Jewes*. Therefore as the *infants of the Jewes* were *holy*, so were the *infants of the Profelytes*, (or *believing Gentiles*.)

And forasmuch as the *distribution* of *Gods gifts* (under the *Gospel*) are larger, then they were under the *Law* ; the *infants of believers* now, have the same *spirituall priviledges*, as the *infants of believers* had then ; and have the same *precious holinesse*, which is available to *Baptisme* ; and therefore we may conclude, that when *Christ* came to die for their *sinnes*, he came not to destroy their *soules*, and so to rob them, to *spoyle* them, to make them *spirituall bankrupts*, to take from them his *righteousnes*, and leave them to be clothed with their own *righteousnes* ; But surely, wee may rather conclude, that *Christ* [as he was once himselfe an *infant*, of a *believing parent*, according to the *flesh*] so he loveth the *infants of believers*, because they

Rev. 22. 11.

1 Cor. 6. 14.

* Ver. 15, 16,
17, 18.* Deut. 29. 10,
& 14. 1, 2.* Levit. 26. 11,
12.

* Exod. 31. 13.

Psal. 135. 4.

* Rom. 3. 2.

* Exod. 13. 48.

Eph. 3. 5, 6.

Luk. 2. 7. 16.

they are Subjects of his kingdome. And as he suffered for them, so he doth not onely come unto them, but cast his garment of righteousness over them, and dwell with them, and abide in them; and is a father unto them, as he was to the Inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem. Our God is a God of truth, and therefore he will not deceive his people, nor break his Covenant which he hath made with them; which Covenant is to his Saints thus; *I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed* *; *I will be their God* ** : So sayth the Spirit of Truth, who will not, (nor cannot) lye; Who for strengthening of his peoples faith, and encreasing of their comfort, that their hearts in loving him, might be enlarged, and their joy in delighting in him might be full; he did command a visible signe and seale of the righteousness of faith, to be imposed upon them, and upon their seed, whose God he had testified himselfe to be.

Now those persons to whom God is a God, they are blessed in a speciall manner *, and he is a father unto them *; and those persons to whom God is a God, and a Father, are seperated from Idolaters, and are a holy * peculiar people unto him, directly opposed to those who are unclean *, and out of the Covenant. But God is a God, and a Father to the infants of beleiving parents now, as he was formerly; [for his holy Covenant is sure] and therefore such infants, (even the holy off-spring, and blessed issue of the blessed) are all the sonnes, & daughters of God; and are to be accounted amongst the number of seperated Saints, in covenant with him; for he hath promised to be a God and a father unto the beleiving Gentiles (2 Cor. 6. 18.) as he was unto the beleiving Jewes, (Gen. 17. 7. Jer. 31. 1.) Concerning whom the Lord sayth, *Their children shall be as aforetime*, Jer. 30. 20. whose holinesse is directly opposed to the Idolatry, of those Idolaters, which the Lord commandeth his blessed Saints to seperate from, and is quite contrary to this uncleannesse, which unbelievers, and their infants have; who though they are not bastards, yet they are unholy, because they are out of the Covenant, and God is not their God, nor father, to hallow the, as he is to the holy children of beleiving Gentiles; and as he was to the holy children of the Jewes, in covenant with him.

Thus the Contents of your exposition being not right, wee may justly conceive, that all the Scripture which you bring to confirme it, will be wrong in the application; and your grounds false. But let us heare further what you say.

& 18. 17.

Isa. 22. 21.

* Gen. 17. 7.

** Ver. 8.

* Psal. 33. 12.

* Esa. 9. 6.

* 1 Cor. 7. 14.

2 Cor. 6. 17.

* Rev. 22. 11, 15

Isa. 52. 11.

Rev. 21. 7, 8.

Jer. 30. 20.

A. R.

Lin. 29:

A. R.

Lin. 30.

And I will shew my ground by my thus opening the Text.

The believing Corinthians both men and women, married and single do joyne in a Letter to the Apostle for resolution of many of their doubts touching their severall conditions; this appeares in the first verse, and thence to the 12, and their doubts in this particular, and which he answers in the five verses following, seemes to be this in effect, as if they should thus write; we being borne anew, and made the Sonnes and Daughters of God by Faith in Jesus Christ: and being made holy by his spirit, and taken into Communion and fellowship with Jesus Christ, and his Saints in light, from an estate of darkenesse and death, from being Idolaters, and Children of the Devill, have very uncomfortable cohabitation and fellowship with our wives and husbands; remaining still in their naturall and blind condition so farre different from the estate into which we are now brought: Surely our holy God that bids us touch no uncleane thing, doth not allow us thus to do: And wee feare least wee have done very ill in continuing thus so long for our Marriage wee cannot thinke but it was dissolved when wee first beleevved: And wee ought then to have put away our wives as the Jews did their strange wives; and unto this the Apostle begins his answer in the 12. verse thus; And unto the rest (to wit, of your doubts) speak I, not the Lord, If any Brother have a wife that beleeveth not, if she be content to dwell with him, let him not put her away, And the woman that hath a husband that beleeveth not, if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him: for the unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified to the believing husband, else were your Children uncleane, but now they are holy.

As if the Apostle should have said to them thus, you Corinthians doubt of your cohabitation with your unbelieving married yoke-mates, which there is no cause, for to the pure all things are pure (that is, lawfull things) (namely, whatsoever is lawfull in nature or civill use) sanctified to the believer, and yet even those things are impure to the impure, or unbelieving, for even their mindes and consciences are defiled. Tit. 1. 15. But to the Believer, all things are pure, (that is, as I have already said) all lawfull things, for things that are unlawfull in themselves cannot be sanctified by the faith of a true Believer, no nor to his use; they must be left and abhorred as sinfull and wicked, which if your cohabitation were such as you in weaknesse judge, then was not your marriage lawfull at the first, then it is not lawfull nor sanctified to you now, as you judge it not, and then are your children uncleane: But if your marriage were at first lawfull, then your Cohabitations now with your yoke-mates is like

life lawfull, and then also sanctified to you now by your beleeving, else were your children uncleane (*that is*) unlawfully begotten and Bastards, but now are they holy (*that is*) Legitimate and no Bastards.

Ans. Here hath been many words to little purpose, as appeareth by your own Conclusion; for the Tenour of all is, that which you have affirmed before *, which is your Conclusion now *. As if the Apostle should say, *Else were your Children* unlawfully begotten, and *bastards*, but now are they legitimate, and no bastards; A very poore collection, or rather restriction of the Apostles words! But that this restriction is in the Text, wee must take it upon your bare word; for you have brought no Scripture, which any way cleareth this your Affirmation. But it hath been proved before, that the Apostle meaneth a religious holinesse; a holinesse in relation to faith, and to the holy Covenant of God; in which Covenant, beleevers & their infants are now, under the Gospel. And this may further appeare unto you by these Considerations.

First, That the Apostle (in this place of Scripture) speaketh not of all infants, but onely of the infants of beleeving parents in Covenant; for he doth not say to unbelievers, that their children are holy, neither doth he direct his speech unto any unbeliever, but unto beleevers; wherefore this principally concerneth beleevers, that they might know the priviledges, which appertain unto them and their seed, according to the covenant of God, which declareth that God will be their God.

Secondly, The Apostle doth not say that the [unbeleeving] husband or wife sanctifieth the [beleeving] husband or wife, but the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the beleeving husband, and the unbelieving husband in the beleeving wife; (that is to say, in consideration that he is his sanctified yoke-fellow;) Where wee are to note, that though the unbelieving wife have a priviledge to be sanctified in her beleeving husband, yet not to sanctifie her beleeving husband; nor hath the unbelieving husband, any priviledge to sanctifie his (beleeving) wife. Nor doth it need (in this case) for beleevers are holy without them; though their unbelieving yoke-fellows are not sanctified without them.

Thirdly, Wee are to note from the Apostles words, *Else were your children uncleane, but now are they holy*: That because the unbelieving wife

* Pag. 9. lin.

26, 27.

* Pag. 10. lin.

31, 32.

Gen. 17. 7, 8.

wife is sanctified to the believing husband, or the unbelieving husband to the believing wife, therefore the children are holy, else not.

Fourthly, We are to take notice that the cause of the sanctification of the unbelieving wives (or that which made them to be so sanctified) was two things.

Frist, Their abiding.

And Secondly, Because their yoke-fellows were believers, if he yoke-fellow be a believer, else she cannot be so sanctified to the believer, for that that is not, cannot be said to be.

Fifthly, The Apostle treateth of holinesse; which wee are to take for that excellent spirituall holinesse, which becometh the Lords House, even such a holinesse which Abraham and his infants had. Which holinesse giveth the persons who have it, visible right to the covenant of Grace, and seales thereof. The Apostle speaketh of holinesse, and doth no way lessen it, and therefore considering what the infants of believers have been, & what Christ hath done for them wee may well understand that the holinesse which they have now is a holinesse in relation to the covenant and Church of God.

Sixthly, It evidently appeareth from the Apostles words, that wee may safely conclude, that such children (spoken of here) are different from heathens; for the unbelieving wife had not that priviledge to bring forth such a holy seed unto a heathen. And so the like may be said for the unbelieving husband, that he could not beget a holy seed of her that was an unbelieving wife, but it is peculiarly bound up in the believing yokefellow. Therefore the children of one (or both) believing parents are holy indeed, taking the Scripture in the largest extent.

Seventhly, If the Apostle had said to the believers, that the children were unholy, nevertheless, you might still have made such a collection, as you have here, (to wit) that he meant that they are no Bastards, but legitimate; for the legitimate children, whose parents are neither of them believers, are unholy; and yet they have your holinesse (to wit) that which evidenceth them to be no Bastards. Wherefore that the Apostle Paul meaneth such a holinesse, which you speake of, we may not in reason conclude; but the contrarie, as hath been observed before (namely) that the Apostle meaneth a holinesse directly opposite to the uncleannesse spoken of 2 Cor. 6. 17. And also in this place, Cor. 7. 14. When he saith, Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy. But you (in giving the sense according to your sense, or understanding

derstanding) say it is thus; Else were your children Bastards, but now are they no Bastards!

And further you say;

And that this is the genuine sence of this place, may further and clearly appeare by the generall scope of the Apostle in the 20, 21, 22, 23. verses following in the same Chapter, where he after he had resolved the married Beleevers not to depart from their lawfull yoke-mates, he then in these verses exhorts Servants and all others, to abide likewise in the lawfull callings wherein they were before their Conversion, and seemeth to tell them in effect thus much; That their being converted to the faith, did in no wise release them from any lawfull Covenants and civill duties in their severall relations wherein they stood before, but bound them to a more due performance of all such obligations towards all men, but in point of Religion and worship of God, therein they were not to be in subjection to any, save onely to Jesus Christ, who had therefore bought them with a price.

Ans. All which you have sayd here, maketh nothing for your purpose, for vindication, illustration, or confirmation of your strange restriction of the Apostles words; but rather maketh against you, for as much as the Apostle desireth every beleever to abide in the same calling wherein he was called. So that the beleeving married persons had no need to put away their unbelieving yoke-fellows, for as much as the Lord allowed them to abide together, and that the unbelieving yoke-fellows were so sanctified for producing a holy seed; Else were your children unclean, (sayth the Apostle) but now are they holy. But you pretend that you gathered your interpretation (Else were your children Bastards, &c.) from the generall scope of the Apostle in the 20, 21, 22, 23. verses following of the same Chapter.

The words therefore I will repeat at large, because you shall see that here is nothing in these verses, which you pretend, or by which you have any occasion to urge what you doe.

Ver. 20. Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called.

Ver. 21. Art thou called being a servant, care not for it? but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. Ver. 22. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lords freeman: Likewise also he that is called being free, is Christs servant. Ver. 23. Ye are bought with a price, be not yete the servants of men.

Now consider what ground you had to build such an affirmation, that the Apostle in speaking of holinesse, (1 Cor. 7. 14.) doth not mean a holinesse in relation to faith; and that where he sayth, Else were

A. R.
Pag. 10. lin.
33.

10. 11. 12.

A. R.
10. 11. 12.
13. 14. 15.
16. 17. 18.

were your children uncleane, but now are they holy; he meaneth, *et*
were your children bastards, but now are they no bastards!

What title of Scripture is here to warrant these your vaine conceits, in thus opposing *holy infants*? Or upon what reason doe you ground these *unreasonable collections*? Is it because the *Apostle* sayeth that the *called of the Lord*, are the *Lords freemen*, the *Lords servants*, *are bought with a price*? Surely, this maketh nothing against *holy infants* being in *Covenant*; for they are bought with the same price. Christ came not to damnifie them, but to dignifie them; not to make them loosers, but gainers. And all this is wrought by him, in whom is all fullnesse, and no emptinesse; riches, and no povertie; life, and no death; He it is that came to give himselfe a *ransome* for them.

But you would inferre, that because *beleevers* are exhorted by *Paul* to performe their *civill Covenants*, and *lawfull Contracts* which they have made with men, that therefore it appeareth that the gloss which you gave upon the *Apostles words*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is a true interpretation. What weight is in your words? let any one that hath sense and reason judge; For the like might have been objected at the time of the *Law*, against the *infants* of the *Church* then, whom the *Lord* did call and sanctifie, and cause to approach neere unto him; that because the *parents*, and others, were to performe their *Conditions* and *bargains*, which they made each with other (or with *strangers*) not changing, or going from their word, though it were to their hindrance, that therefore their *holy infants* then had more holinesse then a meer *legittimacie*, nor were different from the *Infants of Heathens*, and *Infiaells*.

Were it not foolishnesse thus to thinke? [much more to a firme] yea, surely! and therefore such affirmations of yours are to be taken for *sensles imaginations*, and *vaine conceptions*, not worthy to be uttered to any [much lesse unto many.] Neither should they (at this time) have been mentioned heer, but to manifest the vanitie thereof. That *reasonable creatures* may not be *luded*, by such *unreasonable collections*, and *false inferences*; But examine what they receive before they receive it; and embrace nothing but what is agreeable to the *Rule of Truth*.

Further you say;

And this may likewise appeare in *Mal.* 2. 14, 15. where the *Spirit of God* by the *Prophet* sheweth the reasons why their offerings were not accepted, because (saith he) *God hath been witnesse between thee and the wife of thy youth* (that is his first wife then living) against whom

psal. 15. 4.

A. R.
Pag. 11. at
lin. 5, to lin.
23.

thou hast dealt treacherously, yet shee is thy companion, and the wife of thy Covenant, and did not he make one, yet had he abundance of the Spirit, and wherefore one in that he sought a godly or holy seed, therefore keepe your selves in spirit, and let none trespasse against the wife of his youth: *In which words it plainly appeareth that the scope of the place is, that those Children which are generated by one man and one woman lawfully married, are a godly or holy seed, and those that are generated otherwise, are not so but Bastards. And the reason of this holiness ariseth not herefrom any relation they had to the Jewish State, nor from any Church Covenant, but meerly from Gods first Institution of Marriage in the Creation, and his then providing one woman for one man, and which therefore is of Universall concernment to all man-kinde, by the Law of Creation.*

Ans. Herein you pervert the Scripture, and bring such Conclusions therefrom, which are not included therein.

Whereas you say, it is his first wife then living; I aske you why not his second *wife then living? If you will limit it *onely* to the first wife, then it seems by your speech that he might deale treacherously with the other, and beare no blame for it. But you should know, that these *Jewes*, to whom the Lord speaketh, were taught to follow the righteous steps of their *holy parents*, and not to deale treacherously with any of their wives.

You say, that the scope of this place in Mal. 2. 14, 15. is, *That those Children which are generated by one man, and one woman, lawfully married, are a godly, or holy seed, and those that are generated otherwise are not so, but Bastards.* But that this is the scope of the place, wee must take upon your bare word, (or else choose,) for Scripture to prove it you have none. But (by these your speeches) it seemeth that you would have us to beleeve, that godlines & holines of children dependeth upō the parents lawfull generating of them. And so by this it will follow, that all the legitimate Infidells in the world are godly and holy, both young and old; which is very strange, and absurd, and overthroweth the Scriptures, which declareth that there hath been alwayes a difference between the holy and prophane, between beleevers and Infidells, between the Infants of the Church, and the Infants out of the Church; one sort being called, the children of God, the other, the children of men.

Againe, This speech of yours in saying that the children of one man, and one woman lawfully married, are a godly and holy seed; and those that are generated otherwise, are not so but Bastards. It doth

* Jacob had 2 wives, Leah and Rachell; the one was elder then the other, and one was married before the other: But the children which he had by the, as also those by Billa and Zilpah, were all holy in their infancie, and so are the Infants of beleevers, a godly and holy seed; and all other Infants are otherwise; whether legitimate, or illegitimate.

imply that then all legitimated persons shall be saved, and that no Bastards shall be saved. And so out of your owne mouth (for ought you know) you bring a heauey *condemnation*, and sentence of *condemnation* against your selfe; for it seemeth by your words, that your owne assurance of *salvation*, must rest meerly upon *humane testimony*; for you know not whether you are *legitimate*, or no, but by the testimony of your *parents*, which if they were not *lawfully married* at the time of your begetting, then where is your *godlines* and *holiness*? You have it not at all upon your own grounds; howsoever, at the best, I thinke you will say, that you have it not from your owne knowledge, but by *humane testimony*.

But (for your comfort) you should consider, that in a religious respect, a Bastard, if he be a *Convert*, must not be rejected, as a cast-away; for although his father and his mother sinned in his procreation, yet their sinne shall not be imputed unto him; neither will the Lord reject him anywhit the more for his being *unlawfully begotten*.

Yea, though *believing parents* should (through temptation,) degenerate from Gods institution, by begetting children contrary to Gods Law, yet we will not say, but as there is repentance & forgiveness for the parents returning unto God, so the believing parents may have hope (from the Scripture, that sweet fountaine of consolation) that God will not impute that their sinne unto their children, who never sinned actually, but will receive them to mercy with themselves.

So Davids childe, which he had by the wife of Uriah the Hittite, though it was *unlawfully begotten* (contrary to Gods institution in Paradise) yet it doth evidently appeare, that we have no ground to say, that the infant was out of Gods covenant, any more then David was. David repented, and his sinne was forgiven him, and his childe was cleane, both in a civill, and religious respect; the which cannot justly be sayd of any infant, whose parents are both of them *unbelievers*, though they are *lawfull husband and wife*, and the childe *legitimate*; yet the parents (being neither of them in the Covenant) were not esteem any of their infants to be *godly*, or *holy*, neither from 1 Cor. 7:14. nor from any other Scripture.

In consideration whereof it doth appeare, that there is a difference between the infants of the godly, and the infants of the wicked; and that the holiness which differenceth them, is a *spiritual holiness*; For in respect of *legitimacy*, some of the infants of *unbelievers* had the preheminance, when some of the infants of *believers* had not.

not, and yet the infants of believers (whether legitimate, as Isaac, or illegitimate, as Pharez) were in respect of their religious sanctification, the only infants, whom God accepted of visibly in his Covenant: But as for the others, which were out of the Covenant, God rejected them, whether they were legitimate or illegitimate; So then, it appeareth that it is the holy Covenant, which demonstrateth the children of believers to be holy and members of the visible Church, as the holy infants were in former times.

By this you may see, how you are deceived, both in mistaking, and mis-constructing the words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 7. 14. and misunderstanding, and perverting the words of the Prophet, Mal. 2. 14, 15.

Your next words are these;

In the same sense is the Apostle to be taken, Heb. 13. 14. when he saith, Marriage is honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled, but if hypocrites and Adulterers God will judge.

If Marriage be honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled, then he saith of that Bed must needs be undefiled (that is) if a man and a woman be joined together, the issue of all unlawfull conjunctions are uncleane, illegitimate, and Bastards. Now this holinesse and unholinesse of Children, proceedeth not from the holinesse or unholinesse of the Parents; But from the lawfull or unlawfull conjunction of the Parents in the begetting of their Children; for the Apostle in this place speaketh of all men universally.

That the Apostle speaketh of all men universally in Heb. 13. 14. when he saith, that Marriage is honourable amongst all, is (in a sense) true; but that he speaketh of all men universally in 1 Cor. 7. 14. is not true in any sense; for the Apostle Paul in this place speaking to the members of the Church, of that which principally concerned them, he groundeth his speech concerning the holinesse of children, and sanctification of the unbeliever (to that use) upon the faith of one of the parents, that if one of the parents be a believer, though the other parent be an unbeliever, the Children are holy, that is to say, they are under the holy Covenant; And so it necessarily implyeth that if neither parents are believers, the children are unholy, that is, they are not born holy, nor under the holy Covenant. For it was faith that made the believers your fathers to be so sanctified to him, as the Apostle speaketh, Because he was a believer, the Infidel was sanctified to him; For to an unbeliever shee could not be sanctified, but united to a believer, And therefore the children of those believers were holy

because one of the parents was a beleever, and this faith (so sanctifying the unbelieving yolk-mates to this end, and use) made the children holy; which cannot be sayd of an infant, whose parents are neither of them beleevers; though his parents were honourably married, and the bed undefiled in his procreation, but he is unholy, ungodly, and out of the Covenant, neither of his parents being holy, nor any of them sanctified then in themselves, nor sanctified in (by, or to) a beleever, for producing a holy seed, spoken of in 1 Cor. 7. 14.

But you goe on still, and say, that
It seems that the holines here of the children, ariseth not from the faith or holines of the parents, but meerly from the lawfull marriage and conjunction of the parents in begetting their Children.

* It is even so.

Ans. Is it even so? How is it even so? Doth the holines of the holy children (spoken of in 1 Cor. 7. 14. arise meerly from the lawfull marriage, &c? How prove you this? Who revealed this unto you? Belike you thinke your bare affirmation (it is even so) is sufficient prooff; It may be, you will say, that Pharez and Zarah were ungodly and unholy, and out of the Covenant, because their parents had not lawfull marriage at their conjunction in begetting of them: And also that Davids illegitimate Infant was ungodly and unholy & out of the covenant, because he was not lawfully married to Bersheba, before he had begotten him. For surely if the godlines, & holinesse of the Infants of the faithfull arise meerly from the lawfull marriage and conjunction of the parents in their begetting, then all the infants of the faithfull, (whose parents have not lawfull marriage in their begetting) are not holy, nor godly. But seeing the infants of the world, whose parents were married to each other, in their begetting were (though illegitimate,) yet not borne holy, (that is to say) not under the holy Covenant: And seeing that Davids Infant was in the Covenant, though he was illegitimate, (which thing might be sayd of other illegitimated Infants of the Church then.) It plainly argueth, that there is a great gulf, between the holy infants of the Church (spoken of in 1 Cor. 7. 14.) and the infants of the world, whose parents are ungodly, and out of the Covenant. And also it is clearly seen, that you fowly misse it, in saying that the holinesse ariseth meerly from the lawfull marriage and conjunction of the parents in begetting their children. In all which speeches, you still crosse your selfe, in what you have set downe, in the fourth Page of your Booke*, where you

A. R.
Pag. 11. li. 34.

* Lin. 38.

Gen. 38. 16,
17, 24, 25,
26, 29, 30.

2 Sam. 11. 4,
5.

2 Sam. 11. 27.
& 12. 16, 17, 23

* See A. R. his
second Book,
pag. 4.

you enter upon this particular, concerning 1 Cor. 7. 14. For there you affirme (in opposing Infants holinesse.)

First, That there is [now] but one Covenant on foot, &c.

Secondly, That there is but one manner of entering and being therein.

And thirdly, That there is but one holinesse [now] acceptable with God, &c. Consider what you sayd there, and that w^{ch} the Apostle declareth here (in 1 Cor. 7. 14.) That the children of beleevers are holy [now] under the Gospel. [Now] are they holy (sayth he) and so judge your selfe in reason, whether you doe not wrong the Scripture, [and your selfe also unreasonably] in making this one holinesse to be a meer legitimacie, proceeding meerly from the parents lawfull conjunction in matrimony.

But let us see what further reasons you can give for maintenance of this your opinion.

For the question or doubt was only whether they might put away, or depart from their unbelieving yoke-mates, the which the Apostle answers, that they ought not to put them away; and he implies this reason, because they were lawfully married unto them, according to Gods ordinance.

Ans. Here you grant, that the Apostle saith, the beleevers ought not to put away their unbelieving yoke-mates; This maketh directly against you; for it doth demonstrate that the children of beleevers are holy, as the holy children of the Jewes were; which children were not to be put away, whose visible holinesse gave the beleeving Jewes a sufficient ground to administer Circumcision upon them in their infancie; And so Baptisme being unto us, as that was to them; the holy children of beleevers are to have this, as they had that. For these are holy now, and have right to this, as those were holy then, and had right to the other.

And the Apostle Paul, when he exhorteth the beleeving parents, not to depart from their unbelieving yoke-fellows, he yeeldeth this reason, (what ere he implies;) For the unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified to the husband; and for confirmation of this reason (or these reasons) of his, he saith further, Or else were your children uncleane, but now are they holy; so that the holinesse of the children, is the main argument which proved that their unbelieving yoke-fellows were sanctified, and so might be retained, and not put away.

Next you say;

And this he backs with a double reason:

A. R.

Pag. 12. lin. 38

1 Cor. 7. 14.

A. R.

Pag. 12. li. 1, 2,

3, 4, 5, 6.

First,

First, Because their unbelieving yoke-mates were sanctified to use.

Secondly, Because their Children, begotten in that state, are legitimate and holy.

Ans. That the unbelieving yoke-mates of the believers, were sanctified to their use, is true; But this is not all, They were sanctified to them for this use, the male to beget, and the female to conceive, and bring forth, a holy seed; or else were your children unclean, (sayth the Apostle) but now are they holy. And that their children begotten in that state of matrimony, are both legitimate and holy, is very true; keep to this, and then you keepe to the truth; Their children begotten in that estate, are legitimate and holy. If then they are legitimate and holy, as your selfe doe confesse here, why will you seek to debarre them from the priviledges of the holy Covenant? Surely this speech of yours (being considered & compared with your former) you can object nothing now against them (except you crosse your self) but that they may, yea, and ought to be Baptized. But yet I would have you to mind, that it is not their legitimacie, or illegitimacie, which can debarre them from Baptisme, or admit them to it; but it is their holinesse, which giveth them visible right to Baptisme. And this is according to your former speeches, in this your Treatise; Where you affirme, That there is but one holinesse now acceptable with God; and such a holinesse is available to Baptisme, according to the Rule.

Next you say,

On the other side, If they were not so lawfully married to them, these three conclusions would follow.

First, They would not be sanctified to them.

Secondly, Their children would be unclean, and Bastards.

Thirdly, They might and ought to put them away.

Ans. These three Conclusions (you say) would follow, if they were not [so lawfully married] unto them. Here is a threefold injunction implied in these three words [so] [lawfully] [married] And you have put as a preparative to your three Conclusions; all which are laid downe ambiguously.

I doubt not but the unbelieving yoke-fellowes of the believers, were sanctified to them; but this is not all, their servants might be sanctified unto them, and all lawfull things; but their yoke-fellowes were sanctified unto them, for this end and use, for producing a holy seed as I sayd before. And the reason was because one of them (being

a believer

* Pag. 4. lin. 8.

* Pag. 6. li. 2, 3.

* Lin. 38.

A. R.
Pag. 12. lin. 6.

a beleever) sanctified the other; the unbeliever was sanctified, in, by, or to the beleever, for this very end, of generating children unto him, or rather unto God; So that the beleever sanctified the unbeliever. Which thing could not, nor cannot be said of the unbelievers, that they sanctifie, or that their yolk-fellowes are sanctified in them; for they indeed are sanctified in themselves. But by your reasoning, Paul might as well have said, that the beleever is sanctified to the unbeliever, as to the beleever; But so to say, is a turning of the Apostles testimony up-side-downe. And I doubt not but the beleevers children (begotten in that estate of matrimony) were legitimate. But the holinesse is not taken simply from the lawfull marriage, but in respect to the Covenant of Grace, and Church of God, they being borne members of the same, as hath been proved before; Having the holinesse and righteousness of Christ imputed unto them. And seeing that beleevers holy children had the like priviledges, as Isaacs holy children had; therefore, as those children of Isaac were in the Covenant; So were the holy children of beleevers in the time of the Law, and so are these now in the time of the Gospel. They are even in the holy Covenant of God, and so are hallowed with their parents, by the same God, who made their parents holy; the root is holy, and so are the branches, the first fruits are holy, and so is the whole lump. And upon this ground, doth the Apostle Paul prove, that the Corinthians might lawfully keep their unbelieving yolk-mates; because that Else their children were unclean, but now are they holy; because that one of them was a beleeving parent in Covenant; for that is the reason both of the holinesse of the children, and of the lawfull retaining of the unbelieving yolk-mates.

Whereas you say, secondly, *Their children would be uncleane, and bastards.* Lin. 9, 10.

Thirdly, *They might and ought to put them away.*

How doe you prove this, that they might and ought to put them away! I thinke they might and ought to keepe their owne Infants, though illegitimated, Bastards; Yea, and in some considerations to keep their wives. So David according to the Law of God, kept his illegitimate infant; and did not put away the wife who bare

L

it,

If all the legitimate Children in the world, have the holinesse spoken of in 1 Cor. 7. 14. Then all the legitimated Children whose parents are neither of them beleevers, are holy: and then it will follow, that unbelieving yolk mates sanctifie their unbelieving yolk-mates; But this is not to be thought, for it maketh the Apostle Pauls words of none effect, where he bindeth it onely in the beleever, and doth not tell us, that the unbeliever sanctifieth the beleever, or unbeliever, but [the beleever] sanctifieth the unbeliever. And this doth forcibly prove the holinesse (in 1 Cor. 7. 14.) to be another thing then a meer legitimacy; for it proves it to be a peculiar thing unto beleevers, but matrimony is not peculiar to beleeving parents, no more then legitimacy is peculiar to their Infants; others have the same as well as they.

See Mr. Henry
Ainsworth his
Answer to the
Anabaptists
Dialog. pa. 25.

* See A. R.
Pag. 12. lin. 19.

* See A. R.
lin. 16.

* To wit] not
borne visibly
holy in the ho-
ly Covenant,
as the Infants
of beleevers
are.

* Pag. 11. lin.
36, 37, 38.
Lin. 14, 15.

* See A. R.
Pag. 12. lin.
22, 22, 23.

it, but still retained her, and had a *holy* and *elected* seed, by her.

So Mr. Ainsworth answereth this *Objection* of the *Anabaptists*, by proving unto them, that *mis-begotten children*, and *Bastards* were not to be put away in respect of *civill use*; for (sayth he) who should nourish, or bring them up, rather then their owne parents? 2 Sam. 11. 4, 5. & 12. 14, 15, &c.

Moreover, If *unbelievers* cannot be *sanctified* to beget, or conceive, a *holy seed*, except they be yoked unto *beleevers*, as you here grant, (by your words) in saying, that *that which is sanctified to a beleever, being unsanctified to an unbeliever, must needs be sanctified unto him by his beleeving. And so the meaning (of the translations whether by or to) is all one, and may be thus expressed; That the unbelieving wife is sanctified unto the beleeving husband, by, or through his beleeving*] Then it will follow (by your owne confession) that though an *unbeliever* be in the state of *matrimony*, yet (except it be with a *beleever*.) the *unbeliever* cannot procreate such a *holy seed**, spoken of in 1 Cor. 7. 14. And so this argueth, that there is a great and manifest difference [in respect of *holinesse*] between the *infants* of *beleevers*, and the *infants* of *Infidells*; And that this *holinesse* proceedeth not meerly (according to your former inferences*) from a *lawfull conjunction*, in respect of *Matrimony*, which is *honourable* to all; Neither doth the *unbelievers* being *sanctified*, come simply by being in the *honourable* state of *Marriage*, (which those have who are not so *sanctified*) but because she (or he) is coupled in *marriage* with such a *beleever*. Keep still to this, [that the *unbelieving* *yoak-fellow* may be *sanctified* to her (or his) *beleeving* *yoak-fellow*, but not to any *unbeliever*;] And then there will be some more hope, that you will be drawn out of your *Anti pedobaptisticall* errors, for (as I sayd before) this doth shew, that those *children* whose parents are neither of them *beleevers*, are not *holy*, nor *sanctified*, by their birth, from any ground appearing, in 1 Cor. 7. 14. or any other Scripture.

Moreover, I know none that pleadeth that the *unbelieving* wife of the *beleever*, should be admitted to *Baptisme*, and *Church-fellowship* with her *beleeving* husband. And yet shee is *sanctified* unto him, in the enjoyment of her, to bring forth a *holy seed*; and therefore (in this respect) far different from his *cattell*, and *beasts*, with whom he may not so unite himselfe; they are not so *sanctified* to him, as to bring forth a *holy seed*; but his wife is; which difference you doe not set downe, when you say*, that shee is no otherwise *sanctified* then

then servants, and his cattell, and beasts. But you should have minded, that the Beasts are sanctified to him, as beasts, the servants, as servants, and the unbelieving wife, is sanctified in him, (to him, or by him,) as a wife. But touching the children, they are holy, under the holy Covenant; as hath been formerly observed, and proved, and shall be further cleared.

To another Question which you call an Objection; *Whether the Children of beleevers have no more priviledge, then the children of Heathens, Turkes, and Infidells*: You say *

In respect of the Covenant of Grace and Salvation none at all.

Ans. If by their children heer, you meane their infants, then I absolutely affirme and will prove, that the infants of beleevers have more priviledge then the infants of unbelseving Heathens, in respect of the Covenant of grace, and salvation; for God hath testified to Abraham *; saying, *I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.* And this is the new Covenant of grace, and of salvation, That God will be our God, and wee shall be his people: Which Covenant is not made unto the wicked and their off-spring, to Turkes, and Heathens, who are without God in the world. Nor have they any ground to hope for the salvation of their infants; for true hope is grounded upon some promise of God, which they are destitute of; and where God hath made no promise, who can expect performance? Touching secret things, they belong unto the Lord our God, but things revealed, appertain to us and our children * for ever.

And whereas you say *, *It commeth not by any naturall Birth, but by the worke of the Spirit*; for the Spirit bloweth where it listeth, Joh. 3. 7, 8. And God is no respecter of persons: But in every Nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him, Act. 10. 34, 35.

I answer; As the Saints generation doth not hinder their regeneration, so their naturall birth, doth not hinder the birth of the Spirit; for the Spirit bloweth where it listeth; And yet the sound thereof may be heard by the testimonies of Scripture; w^{ch} declareth that the Spirit of God is in all that are his, and he hath wrought upon some of the infants of beleevers miraculously, before they were born; and God loveth all his Saints, without respect of persons *; yea, he respecteth the poorest of their infants, before the infants of the world, w^{ch} are without, though they are never so rich. In every nation he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him, Act. 10. 34, 35.

A. R.
Pag. 12. li. 27.
28.

A. R.
* Lin. 29.

* Gen. 17. 7.
Jer. 30. 22.
Ezek. 37. 27.
Heb. 8. 10.

Rev. 21. 3.

2 Cor. 6. 16, 18.

* Deut. 29. 29.

* Pag. 12. lin.
30.

John 3. 8?

* God hath
promised to
circumcise our
heart, and the
heart of our
seed: and this
is the work of
the Spirit.

And as those *infants* (in the time of the *Law*) whom he claimed visibly for his own in speciall, were not then to be judged destitute of his *Spirit*; no more are such holy *infants* now; for as Gods *Spirit* is the *Spirit* of promise, so God is alwayes as good as his word.

Whereas you say*, In respect of the means of salvation, their priviledge in having beleeving parents, is far more then those that have not, because beleeving parents may be a means to bring their Children to the knowledge and faith of *Jesus Christ*, and so be instruments of their salvation, as Saint Paul saith here; The beleeving husband may save his un-beleeving wife.

I answer; If by children here, you meane *infants*, if this be all the priviledge you will afford them, I thanke you for nothing! But it is well they are not at your finding; for indeed this measure of yours is somewhat scant.

If they die in their *infancie*, how shall their parents bring them to the knowledge and faith of *Jesus Christ*? yea, how shall they beleeve that they goe to heaven, if they had not some warrant to beleeve, that the worke of regeneration was wrought in them before? If the righteousness of *Jesus Christ*, and the graces of his holy *Spirit* were not imputed unto them before? In death there is no remembrance of God; in the grave who shall praise him? But the Comforter (which would not have beleeving parents mourne, as those which have no hope) hath informed them, that he is the Circumciser of their heart, and of the heart of their seed*; a plain evidence, that they love, and know him, or rather are beloved and knowne of him; He that loved them in their life, will not forsake them in their death; For the dead which die in the Lord are fully blessed, yea, saith the *Spirit*, for they rest from their labours, and their workes doe follow them*.

But by your words it appeareth, that you judge the *infants* of beleevers, and *Infidells*, all alike.

Yea, the *Infidell servants*, which serve beleevers (if these your words be true,) have a greater priviledge then the *Infants* of beleevers; for the servants are capable of instruction, (in respect of a naturall capacitie) but the *Infants* are not.

Now if you will still grant, that the *Infants* of beleevers, (though they die in their *infancie*) have a greater priviledge, then the *infants* of un-beleevers, then you must also grant, that that their priviledge resteth in something else, besides the bare publication of the Gospel, which they are not in their *infancie* capable of.

And

See A.R.
Pag. 12. lin. 34.

Psal. 6. 5.

1 The. 4. 13.

Deut. 30. 6.

Rev. 14. 13.

And you should not have over-topped them so far as to say, that because *believing parents* may be a means to bring their children to the knowledge, and faith of *Jesus Christ*, that therefore they have no more privileges, then the *unbelieving wife*; As if this were the greatest privilege which *believers infants* have, which *unbelievers* themselves may have, *Mark. 16. 15.* But you should rather have reasoned thus;

Believing parents may publish the Gospel to their *unbelieving servants*, & *unbelieving wives*, & to all other *unbelievers*, but they may, yea, & ought to apply it to their *infants*, as well as to themselves, & also to all those whom they are to esteem in the state of salvation; he that hath faith thus to do is a *Christian*; he that hath not so much faith, but refuseth to apply the Gospel so, the Lord be mercifull to his soule! by giving him repentance, and remission of his sinne.

All godly parents [like faithfull Abraham] were to teach their children the way of life, both what things were, and what things signified (*Gen. 19. 17. 19. Josh. 4. 21. 24.*) and to declare unto them the goodnesse of God in the land of the living; yea, to hide nothing from them, which might be profitable to them, or beneficial for them. But as they grew up to be capable of knowledge, the parents were (as before mentally, so now) verbally, to apply the promises unto themselves, and their children, &c. *Psal. 78. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.* And surely this is one cause why the Land mourns, & why the Lord smiteth the earth with cursing, because the heart of the parents are not linked to their *Infants*. This part of good *Elias* and *John Baptists* ministry, doth not worke upon them. And how can it worke upon them so long as they continue in their sinnes, and so wrap themselves, and their off-spring, in many mischiefs and miseries; and doe not choose life, (the thing that pleaseth God,) but refuse it, and follow the wayes of the strange woman, whose wayes are wayes of death, and whose steps reach downe to hell.

And surely, I may well say unto you, that those are *Physicians* of no value, who in stead of curing them, doe kill them, and in stead of preserving them, doe poyson, harden, corrupt, and pervert them, with such damnable doctrine, w^{ch} so violently possesseth them, that they thinke the *Infants* of *believers* have no privilege at all in respect of the Covenant of grace; no more then the children of *Turkes* and *Heathens*, who are unholy. A dangerous doctrine! and to be abhorred, detested, and witnessed against, by those that feare the God of heaven,

* See Mar. 16,

16.

Luk. 1. 76, 77,

78, 79.

Mal. 4. 5, 6.

and desire to make a difference between the *precious* and the *common* against all such *Mongrell* opposites, who by speech, and writing (contrary to the Tenour of the whole Scripture) do labour to make all infants in one condition! Thus coupling *light* and *darknesse*, *God* and *Belial*, the *beleever* and the *Infidell* together! But woe unto them may we say, (as sayth the Prophet *Isaiab*, *Isa. 10. 1.*) which decree *unrighteous decrees*, and write *grievousnesse*, which they have prescribed. Thus drawing * *iniquitie* with the cords of *vanitie*, and *sinne* as it were with a cart-rope. Woe ** unto them that call *evil good*, and *good evil*, that put *darknesse* for *light*, and *light* for *darknesse*; *bitter* for *sweet*, and *sweet* for *bitter*.

* *Isa. 5. 18.*

** *Ver. 20.*

Pfal. 73. 1.

Pfal. 115. 12,
13, 14, 15.

* See *A. R.*
Pag. 12. lin.

40.
Pag. 13. li. 1, 2.
Pag. 13. l. 3.

Yet surely *God* is good unto *Israel*, (may wee say) to those that are pure in heart. The Lord hath been mindfull of us; He will *blesse* us. He will *blesse* the house of *Israel* (saith that *sweet* finger of *Israel*) He will *blesse* the house of *Aaron*: He will *blesse* those that *fear* the Lord, with small and great. The Lord shall increase you more and more, you and your children. You are *blesst* of the Lord, who hath made the heaven and the earth.

NExt * you say, The fourth Scripture is, That which speaks of *Christs* commanding little Children to be brought unto him, and sayd; That of such is the kingdom of *God*. Hence (you say) therefore some reason; The kingdom of *God* belongeth to little Children, why not the *Seales*?

I Ans. If by these [some] you mean the people of the *Seperation*; then (I say) you have not set it downe according to our expression: It is too generally laid downe; We say the kingdom of heaven belongeth to the *Infants* of *beleevers*; and we doe not barely question, why not the *seales*? But we set it downe affirmatively, that the *seales* do belong to the *infants* of *beleeving* parents. But for as much as our poynt is particularly concerning the *Baptisme* of *infants*; I intend to proceed directly to the matter in hand, and answer your trifling objections by the way as I trace you.

Mat. 28. 19.
Mat. 16. 16:

First, It is to be minded, that *Baptisme* is one of the *priviledges* of *Christs Church*, which is his house and kingdom.

Mat. 10. 14.
Mat. 19. 14.

Secondly, It is also to be minded, that *Iesus Christ*, the eternal Sonne of *God*, and Lord of *Glory*, and of all administrations, and giver of every good and perfect gift, when he sayth, *Suffer the little Children to come unto me, &c.* For of such is the kingdom of heaven. He doth hereby apply the Gospel unto them. I say, It is Gospel which

which he speaketh here. And so wee are to understand that [with the kingdome] the infants of beleivers have the Gospel of the kingdome also appertaining unto them, together with the priviledges thereof.

It being so, the Argument lieth thus;

Those persons to whom the Gospel may lawfully be applyed, to whose Baptisme doth of right belong, and upon them it must be administred, *Mar. 16. 16. Mat. 28. 19.*

But the Gospel may lawfully be applyed to Beleevers infants, *Isa. 22. 24. Jer. 30. 20. 22. Mat. 19. 13, 14. Mar. 10. 13, 14, 15, 16. Luk. 18. 15, 16, 17. & 19. 9, 10. Gen. 17. 7, 8, 11, 13, 14. Rev. 21. 3. & 22. 14.*

Therefore Baptisme doth of right belong unto them, and must be administred upon them.

The first and second part of this Argument, being thus expressed, and also proved by the Scriptures, cited for Confirmation thereof; the Conclusion is true and certaine; and may further appeare so to be, by what hath been said in this Treatise, (where the point hath been handled) and may be further evinced, by taking away whatsoever else you can object against the same.

And now let us heare your Answer:

First, That if Infants have right to one of the seales (if I may so call them) then to both; to the Supper as well as to Baptisme.

To which I reply, That this objection is impertinent. The Infants of beleivers (the Lords blessed Saints) have right both to Baptisme, and the Lords Supper; as the infants of beleivers in the time of the Law, had right to Circumcision, and the Passeeover; and wee are to minde, that although persons were not (nor could not be capable*) at all times to receive the Ordinances, yet they had right unto them then, and so persons now have right to those heavenly things, which they are not capable to receive; So wee know that divers Saints (though in yeares) have right to the preaching of the Word; yet have not capabilitie* (at all times) to conceive what is taught. Wherefore your arguing (that if Infants have right to one of Gods Ordinances, they have right to both) hath no weight in it against Infants right to Baptisme.

Your next words are, that

Here (they say) not to the Supper, untill they be able to examine themselves, which is required of all that receive the supper.

Answer. If by [they,] you mean those of the Separation; And if by

[]
Where the kingdome is, ther's the Gospel. Get the kingdome, thou hast God, and Gospel, and all.

Infants Baptisme, Pure Divine.

A. R.
Pag. 13. lin. 5.

Mar. 10. 14, 16
1 Cor. 7. 14.

* In respect of a naturall capabilitie.

* In case of deafnesse, or other defects in nature.

A. R.
Lin. 8, 9.

* Lin. 51

Mat. 26. 26.

* Luk. 22. 19.

The Lords supper is active, & Baptisme passive, in referēce to the receivers thereof.

by infants, you mean their infants; I answer then, that wee affirm no such thing, as you would father upon us*, (that holy infants have no right to the Supper!) for we know they have a right unto it, though they want *capabilitie* to partake of it; The Lords Supper being an *active Ordinance* [there is more required then a bare suffering, for there is an *acting* required of the partakers thereof; Take, eat, doe this in remembrance of me*, &c. But Baptisme, [being a passive ordinance] the partie upon whom it is imposed, is not required, [actually] to doe it, but onely to suffer it to be done.

So the infants of beleevers in the time of the Law, had right both to Circumcision, and the Passeeover; yet Circumcision they might receive, (when they were not capable to partake of the Passeeover, because that (as hath been formerly minded) there was an *activeness* required of the partaker in partaking, and at administration of the Passeeover, but onely a meer suffering, (by the subject) when Circumcision was imposed upon him. So that holy infants now are capable to receive Baptisme, as the infants in former time were to receive Circumcision; and these are as capable to receive the Supper now, as those infants were to receive the Passeeover then. Wherefore seeing there was no reason to keepe those infants from being Circumcised, though they could not partake of the Passeeover, (having right unto both,) Therefore there is no just reason can be given to debatte such holy infants from Baptisme now, though they cannot partake of the Supper; yet they have right both to Baptisme and the Supper.

It may be you will say, that all that had right to the Passeeover, were not to be kept from it, but to partake of it at the time of administration; and that all who have right to the supper, are to partake of it when it is administred, &c.

Ans. No; not so; for persons might have just occasions, which might justly hinder them from the Passeeover, and yet they had right unto the Passeeover; As when they were *uncleane*, or in a journey, yet they had still a right unto the Passeeover, (though they were not at that time to partake of it.) And if they were driven from the society of the Saints, they had still right unto the ordinances, though they could not come to enjoy them. So if persons were sicke, we will not say, that the Passeeover was to be infused in them, against their stomach; yet had they a right thereto, though they could not partake thereof.

When

When the *Children of Israel* were in *Egypt*, they were commanded to eat the *Passeover*, with their loynes girded, their shooes on their feete, and their staves in their hands, and to eat it in hast, for it was the *Lords Passeover*; and though every member of the *Congregation*, had right thereto*, yet we will not say, they were to partake thereof, when they could not, for the causes before specified, or the like occasions.

Exod. 12. 11.

* Exod. 12. 47.

And as it may be said concerning comming to the *Passeover* then, so it may be said of communicating in the *Lords Supper* now, that all that have right thereto, are not commanded to partake thereof.

And those *Saints* then that could not partake of the *Passeover*, did not (and these that cannot partake of the supper, doe not) sinne in not partaking thereof; and therefore these are not commanded or injoynd by *God* to partake of the *Supper* (for *God* requireth not impossibilities of us,) neither are we commanded (or injoynd) to administer it unto them; but *circumcision* was commanded to be administered upō, & unto the other; therefore it appeareth that though they were not capable [actually] to receive the *Passeover*, yet seeing they were still the *Saints of God*, they had right thereunto.

And the like may be sayd concerning all the holy *infants* of the *Church* now; and concerning the *ordinances* now, which are in stead of the *ordinances* then, and in effect the same. Though the *Infants of Believers*, have right to the *Supper*, yet have they not capability to receive it, and therefore it must not be administered unto them; but *Baptisme* [that passive Ordinance] may, because there is required no actually doing of the receiver, but a suffering, for the *Water* in *Baptisme* is not to be drunken by them, nor to be infused into them, but imposed upon them.

Moreover, Concerning their not having the *Supper*, you have answered your selfe, in answering them, when you say*, That *Examination* (in respect of the *Supper*) is required onely of men of yeares, not of infants, who are not able to performe it.

A. R.

* Pag. 13. lin.
10, 11, 12,
13, 14.

Further you tell us, That if your *Author*, nor memory faile you, *Children* were admitted as well to the *Supper*, as to *Baptisme*, for many yeares in time past, (and over against in the margent of the page* you name *Parker on the Crosse.*)

* Page 13. at
lin. 15.

Ans. Indeed you may suspect your memory, if you take your imagination to be your memory. And you may expect, that your *Author* can stand you in little stead, in opposing the *Baptisme* of *Infants*;

A good object may faile a bad subject; and so your *Author* may faile you, especially, he being neither an *Author*, nor upholder of your error, which you labour by all meanes to uphold.

Next you say;

A. R.
Lin. 17, 18, 19

And why not to the one as well as to the other, seeing the same reasons are alike in both, and will center into one, if fully prosecuted?

I Answer, This is but a begging of the *Question*, I have told you why not to the one, as well as to the other, Because they are capable of the one (in respect of a *naturall capacitie*) but not of the other. And therefore I deny that the *reasons* are alike in both; or will center into one, though [never] so fully prosecuted.

* Pag. 13. li. 21,
22.

Whereas you further oppose *infants Baptisme*, saying, that *no *Infant* is required by God, in *Scripture*, to beleeve, or to repent, or to be baptized by any man, &c.

The *Infants*
of beleevers
are not impe-
tinent,

I Answer. That this your speech is ambiguous, and abominable, and you may know, that we stand not for the *Baptizing* of *Infidels*, or those in whose hearts wee cannot rightly judge the foundation of repentance, to be layd. For God hath not required such to be baptized, no more then he did command such to be circumcised in the time of the *Law*. And you should know, that *faith* is the gift of God; & so also is repentance; and though the *Saints* of God are not required to manifest their *faith* and repentance actually, so long as they cannot act yet for to say, that therefore they have not *faith* and repentance, or that wee are not to judge them to have the gifts and graces of the *Spirit*, because they cannot act, is a meer idle toy! and frivolous foppery. But if you will say, that though the *infants* of beleevers cannot manifest *faith* and repentance, no more then *Isaac* could (who was a *childe* of promise in his *infancie*) yet they are to be judged to have *faith* and repentance, notwithstanding. Then you will agree with us in this truth. But if you will say, you deny it, and will not assent unto it, and that therefore the *infants* of beleevers, ought not to be baptized; Then I tell you, you have your answer long agoe.

* In his Cen-
sure upon the
Anabaptists
Dialog. p. 70.
lin. 19.

Christian Infants (sayth Mr. *Ainsworth* *) Have the grace they speake of, repentance, *faith*, regeneration, &c. Though not actually, or by way of declaration to others; yet they have (through the work of the *Spirit*) the seed and beginning of *faith*, virtually and by way of inclination, so that they are not wholly destitute of *faith*, regeneration, &c. though it be a thing hid, and unknowne unto us, after what manner the Lord worketh these in them. *Eccles. II. 5.*

Which

Which Mr. Ainsworth doth further prove, thus *;

If Infants naturally are some wayes capable of Adams sinne; and so of unbelieve, disobedience, transgression, &c. Then Christian Infants supernaturally, and by grace, are some wayes capable of Christs righteousness, and so of faith, obedience, sanctification, &c. But Infants are capable of the former evils by Adam: therefore they are capable of the later good things by Christ.

That they are capable of the former, he proved (in his treating of originall sinne) from divers Scriptures, as Psal: 51. John 3. Rom. 5. &c. The consequence, to wit, that infants are capable of the later good things by Christ, he proveth thus *.

First, Because the first Adam was a figure of the second Adam, Christ; So that as the sinne of the first Adam, his fault, disobedience, and death for it, came on all his Children, both by imputation, and infection, or corruption of nature; So the righteousness and obedience of Christ, cometh on all his Children, both by imputation, and renewing of nature, unto life and salvation; as the Apostle compareth them, Rom. 5. 12. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. 21.

Secondly, Because Infants (being (by Adam) sinners, Children of wrath, &c.) must be borne againe of the Spirit, or else they cannot see the kingdome of God, Joh. 3. 3. 5. 6. But the Christian Infants, dying in infancie, shall see the kingdome of God, and not be damned, (as the Adversaries grant. *) Therefore by Christs doctrine, they are borne againe of the Spirit: and so must needs (in some measure) have repentance, faith, and holiness, without which there is no regeneration.

Againe, That Infants have the faith, and love of God in them: And regeneration in their measure is thus proved; They to whom God giveth the signe and seale of righteousness by faith, and of regeneration, they have faith and regeneration [for God giveth no lying signe, he sealeth no vaine (or false) Covenants.]

But God gave to Infants Circumcision, which was the signe and seale of the righteousness of faith, and regeneration. Gen. 17. 12. Rom. 4. 11. & 2. 28, 29. Colos. 2. 11.

Therefore Infants had (and consequently now have) faith and regeneration, though not in the crop of harvest by declaration; yet in the bud and beginnings of all Christian graces.

* In the same page, lin. 27. to page 71.

* See his book page 71. lin. 8.

* The old Anabaptists doe grāt, that childrē (dying in their infancie) shall see the Kingdom of God. But some now (that stand against the Baptisme of Infants) say, They are all in the state of damnation; Others (that withstand Infants Baptisme) say, They know not how to judge of them; But I say, by the Scripture, Wee are to judge the infants of beleivers, to be in the state of salvation, and those of them that die in their infancie, are not damned, but saved: And as for other Infants (even the infants of the wicked) we have nothing to doe to judge them within, but without.

They that deny this reason, must either make God the Author of a lying signe, and seale of the Covenant to Abraham, and his Infants; or they must hold, that infants had those graces then, but not now; but which are wicked and absurd to affirme; Or they must say, that Circumcision was not the signe and seale of the righteousness of faith, and then they openly contradict the Scripture, Rom. 4. 11.

- Moreover, As the Apostle in Rom. 5. compareth our naturall estate in Adam, and our spirituall estate in Christ, so may wee, in this case.

If wee cannot justly object against Gods worke in nature, but doe beleve that our Infants are [reasonable creatures] and are borne [not brut beasts, but men] though actually they can manifest no reason, nor understanding more then beasts (yea, a young Lambe knoweth and discerneth his damme sooner then an Infant knoweth his Mother; then neither can wee justly object against Gods worke in grace, but are to beleve, that our Infants are sanctified creatures, and are borne beleivers, not Infidells, though outwardly they can manifest no faith, nor sanctification unto us.

And why should it be thought incredible, that God should worke faith in Infants? If it be because wee know not, or perceive not how it can be, let us consider, that we know not the way of our naturall birth, and other earthly things, Eccles. 11. 5. Job. 3. 8. How then can wee know heavenly things?

If we make question of the power of God; nothing is impossible with him. He made all things of nothing; He can make the dumbe beast speake with mans voyce, Numb. 22. He can make the babe [in the mothers wombe,] to be affected and leap for joy, at the voyce of the word spoken to the mother, Luk. 1. 44. And can he not also worke grace, faith, and holines in Infants? Hath Sathan power by sinne, to infect, and corrupt Infants, (as is before proved) and shall not God have power to cleanse from corruption, and make them holy? If wee make doubt of the [will] of God herein, behold wee have [his promises,] to restore [our losses] in Adam, by his graces in Christ, (as he sheweth in Rom. 5. That he will circumcise our heart, and the heart of our seed to love him, Deut. 30. 6. Wee have the seale of his promise, in giving Circumcision to Infants, to signifie and seale the righteousness of faith, Rom. 4. 11. Gen. 17. And wee have assurance of all his promises, of that to Abraham and his seed in particular, to be confirmed unto us (not abrogated or lessened) by Christ, 2 Cor. 1. 20. Luk. 1. 72. Gal. 3. 14. &c. Wherefore they are but a faithlesse and crooked generation.

ration, that notwithstanding all that God hath spoken and done in this kinde, doe deny this grace of Christ to the Infants of his people, and the scale, or confirmation of this grace by Baptisme now, as it was by Circumcision of old.

Next you say;

Secondly, This reason is grounded upon a great mistake of the sense of the Text; for the words are not unto them belongs the Kingdome, but of such is the Kingdome, (that is) of none else, but of such, as the next words which follow in these Texts, doe manifestly declare; for in Luk. 18. 17. Mar. 10. 15. In both places, where Christ had said, Suffer little Children to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdome of God. He presently confirms it in the next words, thus; Verily, I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdome of God as a little childe, shall not enter therein. As also in Mat. 18. 34. Christ speaking to his Disciples, sayth, Except yee be converted, and become as little children, yee shall not enter into the Kingdome of heaven; Whosoever therefore shall humble himselfe as this little childe, the same is the greatest in the Kingdome of heaven. Whereby it is evident, that when Christ sayth, of such is the Kingdome of heaven, his meaning is not of them, nor of such as them in age, nor understanding, 1 Cor. 14. 20. But of such as them in humilitie, and such like qualifications.

Ans. If you mean heer, that the Seperates do ground their reason upō a great mistake, of the sense of the Text, in saying, that the Kingdome of God belongeth to the Infants, and therefore Baptisme. Then to your impertinent & confused answer, or groundlesse aspersion. I reply.

First, That it is not sufficient to say, that the reason is grounded upon a mistake, unlesse it be so, which if it be not so, then you are mistaken your selfe (and that greatly) both in the reason, and in the sense of the Text also, in charging us with a great mistake, when it is not grounded upon any mistake, much lesse upon a great mistake, and least of all upon a great mistake of the sense of the Text, as you unjustly speake; and therefore your charge is but a treble evill surmise, a meer supposition of that which is not; and this may evidently appeare to be true, because out of Christs owne words, wee may gather that the Kingdome of heaven belongeth to the holy Infants; for, sayth he, of such is the Kingdome of heaven.

Secondly, Wee doe not say, that the words are in expresse rearmes, unto [them] belongs the Kingdome, (you shall not father this upon us,) but of [such] is the Kingdome of God, and yet notwith-

standing the *sense* is rightly taken, according to the *Text*, that the *Kingdome of heaven* belongeth unto the *infants*, and therefore you cannot justly charge our reason to be impertinent, or to be grounded upon any mistake at all, much lesse a mistake of the *Text*; So then it appeareth that the mistake is not ours, but yours; seeing you mistake your selfe, and us, and *Christ*, and all.

Thirdly, I doe not know your meaning, when you rehearse *Christs words*, *Of such is the Kingdome of heaven*, and say (that is) *none else, but of such*, You should know that the *Kingdome of heaven* belongeth to those that are past *infancie*, as well as to *Infants*, *Againe* persons are of the *Kingdome of heaven* as well as *such children*. If you denie this, you will denie your own enterance into the *Kingdome*, or else say you are an *infant*, which thing I suppose you will not doe. But the drift of your interpretation is to prove, that when *Christ sayth*, *Of such*, he meaneth *such*, and none else but *such* [& therefore no *Infants*] For so it appeareth by your words afterwards, when you say, *Christs meaning is* [not of them, nor of such as them in yeares not understanding;] a meer non-sense conclusion; and your ground is *Because Christ sayth* [of such] and doth not say [of them;] But herein you erre, and are mistaken in the word *such*; and your inferences therefrom, are not according to truth; which may appeare thus; As for Instance;

When Paul
sayth, Rom. 1.
3 2. Those that
do such things
are worthy of
death, he meaneth those
things before
specified in the
same Chapter.

Suppose a person should come to you, and before divers persons charge you, saying, *Such persons who doe such things as you doe*, are worthy to be condemned. I suppose the accusation toucheth your own particular person, as much as any other, and that so you will confesse, and take it as meant of you.

But if upon examination of the accuser, you shall find him to faulter, & say, that therefore he meant not you, nor any such thing as you doe, &c. would you not count him a *knave*, or a *foole*, or a *liar*?

Againe, He that should come and say, *Such an argument or arguments as you bring here are good, and full of wisdom, and abound in sense!* you would heare him patiently, and partly, (if not fully) approve of his speech. But if he should draw a consequence from his former words, and say, that therefore (he meaneth, your arguments are evill, and full of foolishnesse, and abound with nonsense!) and that in saying such arguments were good, he doth not mean that your arguments are good at all, nor such as yours, in such a respect, but in respect of such, or such a thing. Would not you begin to wonder at him, and to count him a *madman*? an *idiote*? a *foole*?

foole? or a lyar? or one that setteth himselfe on set purpose to cavill, or quarrell?

Apply this to your selfe, for even so is your owne argument, or objection here against *Infants*; And therefore I hope I may tell you (without giving you any occasion of offence,) that as your vindication unto that person before specified, would be, that your Arguments are such as those which are so answerable to them, that they are such, and that therefore his arguing can make nothing against your Arguments. So I (in answer to you) may say, that the *infants* which Christ tooke up in his armes, are the same with those who are so answerable to them, that they are such; for reason teacheth us to know, that those *infants* then in Christ's armes are such as they then were, & not otherwise then they then were; and so now reason teacheth us, that *reasonable creatures* are as like unto themselves as those to whom they are compared, and that those to whom they are compared rightly, are not more like themselves, then themselves are like themselves, and therefore apply all this to our present purpose, and then wee may see the unreasonable-nesse, and perversenesse, crookednesse and foolishnesse, of those who will so wrest Christ's words, as if when he sayth, *Of such is the kingdome of heaven*, he meaneth not them, but excludeth them, and such as them, and onely includeth some others who are for qualifications like them.

And therefore now (M^r. A. R.) I challenge you, [and all that take your part in opposing *Infants*] to bring me one instance in all the Scripture, where persons are spoken of, and where it is sayd of such, that the persons with whom they are compared, & to whom such a thing is applyed, are not included or comprehended in the word, *such*, as well as those who are compared with them. In the mean time, till you shew such an instance, [which thing you can never doe] I must still rest in the mind of Christ, that he meaneth them as well as any, & includeth them as well as the rest, and doth not exclude them, but include them, in these words, *Suffer the little Children to come unto me, &c. for of such is the kingdome of heaven.*

Fourthly, If Christ had sayd, *Of [them] is the kingdome of heaven*, and had not sayd, *Of [such] is the kingdome, &c.* Then you might have had more colour, for to limit, and restraine the Scripture as you doe. And then you would object; thus,

Yea, it is true Christ as he was God, knew all things, & therefore he (knowing the to be elected) saith in particular, Of them is the kingdome, &c. But

it doth not follow, that therefore such as they are of it, and therefore we can not say, that any other beleivers infants are of the kingdome of heaven besides them. But heer you may see, that this blocketh up your objections, considering that Christ sayth, Of [such] is the kingdome, &c. And that the word [such] is of a larger extent, then the word [them] and includeth them also, as hath been observed before.

Fifthly, If the next words after (both in Luk. 18. and Mar. 10.) doe confirme the former, (as you confesse,) then it still argueth that the reason is *invincible*; and therefore neither you, nor all the men in the world, can overthrow it. It was firme before, and it being (by your own confession) confirmed in the next words after, then it is not contradicted there, as you have contradicted it here, and therefore judge your selfe, whether you have not bestowed labour in vaine, in thus opposing holy Infants. For these Texts doe prove still, that as infants are of the kingdome, so they are not destitute of the graces of the Spirit, without which none are capable Subjects of the Kingdome. Wherefore heer is sufficient demonstration of Infants conversion, humiliation, regeneration, and great estimation, which they have with Jesus Christ, whose word is to be taken, and not refused, it being spirit, and life, and truth, and so directly opposed to your erroneous affirmations, that it quite overthroweth your unsound collections, in your violent opposition of holy infants.

Sixthly, You speake very untruly, and doe abuse and wrong the Scripture exceedingly, by inferring from the premises, That when Christ sayth, Of such is the kingdome of heaven, His meaning is not of them, nor of such as them in age nor understanding. For Christ as he speaketh of them, so he meaneth them, (though he doe not shut out aged persons, that are in respect of holinesse, such as those holy infants then were, or such as these holy infants now are) and he meaneth [such] properly, both in yeares & understanding as may appeare by the scope of the place, where it is sayd, that Christ commanded to suffer them to come unto him; and declareth the reason (namely) because they are Subjects of his kingdome; for of such is the kingdome of heaven (sayth he.) And when he cometh to teach a further lesson, he applyeth it also to persons of yeares, that they should learne to receive the kingdome of heaven, like them, and to be converted, and to cast away all pride, and to humble themselves: All which graces (the fruits of regeneration) the Infants of beleivers are not destitute of, for as much as they are regenerated, they have the seed, and beginning of all Christian graces, as hath been proved before.

Now, that *Christ* meaneth these infants, when he sayth, *Of such is the kingdome*, is cleare in the *Text*, and may partly appeare unto you from the former Considerations. But for further confirmation of the premises, let us minde the scope of the place, and examine the *Scriptures* cited. In which is expressly declared.

First, That [the Infants] were [brought] unto *Christ*, Luk. 18. 15.

Secondly, The persons intent in bringing them (or the reasons why they brought them) was, [that *Christ* should put his hands on them, and pray] Mat. 19. 13.

Thirdly, When *Jesus* saw that the *Disciples* rebuked those which brought them, he was [much] displeased, Mar. 10. 13; 14.

Fourthly, And he [called] them unto him, Luk. 18. 16.

Fifthly, Wee are discreetly to observe, *Christ's* two-fold charge, given unto his *Disciples*. In these words, (1.) *Suffer the [little] Children to come unto me,* (2.) [and forbid them not,] (Mar. 10. 14.) Mar. 19. 14.

Sixthly, Wee are, heedfully, to minde the reason, (which *Christ* rendereth for this) which is expressed, in these words, [For of such is the kingdome of God,] Mar. 10. 14. Luk. 18. 16.

Seventhly, *Christ's* addition, or confirmation of his former speech, or the use (which *Christ's* *Disciples* should make concerning themselves) is not to be forgotten; *Verily, I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdome of God as a little childe, he shall in no wise enter therein,* Mar. 10. 15. Luk. 18. 17.

Eighthly, Wee are to minde *Christ's* act to these *Infants*; which was three-fold; (1.) [He] took] them] up] in] his] armes,] and (2.) [Put] his] hands] upon them,] and (3.) [Blessed them,] Mar. 19. 15. Mar. 10. 16.

All which doth give us sufficient warrant to esteeme highly of them, and of all those who are like them in every respect. Therefore I desire you to weigh these things distinctly, and discreetly; and then, I hope, it will evidently appeare unto you, that you are mistaken in your meaning, and have done very evill, (though you meant never so well) in saying that *Christ's* meaning is not of them, nor of such as them in age, &c.

For indeed, you may as well say, that those were not *Infants* whom *Christ* took up in his armes, and that he did not lay his hands upon them, nor blessed them, nor such as them, in age, and understanding. But surely, if the *Scripture* in speaking of such persons,

* In respect of
his humane
nature.

* Not aged per-
sons like In-
fants.

Isa. 53. 11.

doe not exclude the persons spoken of, then wee have no reason to exclude these *infants* here specified, but to know that *Christ Jesus* who was once an *infant*, and like other *infants*, both in *age*, and *understanding**, he includeth the *infants*, & those like unto them both in *age* and *understanding*; when he saith, *Of such is the kingdom of heaven*.

Consider how that the *infants** were brought unto *Christ*; The intent of those that brought them was good, and their act, in bringing them, was pleasing unto God. The truth of this may appear by observing the declaration of their intention; and likewise *Christ*'s great displeasure, or offence given by and taken at his *Disciples* because they rebuked those that brought them; He was much displeased (sayth the *Holy Ghost* by *Mark*, *Mark*. 10. 13, 14.) which declareth an augmentation, or aggravation of his displeasure: The noting of which, maketh still for clearing the case in controversie; and may serve for further satisfaction of the doubting soule, that by *Sathans* deceit, is apt to thinke, that this righteous servant through his knowledge doth not justifie many *Infants*, as well as others. *Christ*'s double charge unto his *Disciples*, that the holy *infants* should have free access and admittance unto him, without any let or hindrance, by any; and *Christ*'s forcible reason for it, (namely) for (or because) *of such is the kingdom of heaven*, &c. And then, *Christ*'s acts concerning these *infants*, [that he took them up in his armes, and put his hands upon them, and blessed them] doth further declare, the strength and sufficiency of mine, (and the weaknesse and insufficiency of your) interpretation.

Seventhly, As without *Christ*'s minde, you have taken upon you to deliver *Christ*'s meaning, contrary to his owne expressions, manifestations, and commissions; so you cite, 1 *Cor*. 14. 20. for confirmation of your strange restriction of *Christ*'s declaration concerning the *Infants*. As if *Paul* were a Patron of this your fond opinion; but I tell you, in this you are much deceived also, and doe erre (and as I in charitie judge) doe not know the Scriptures. It was no part of *Paul*'s doctrine, to speake of holy *infants* as you doe, he telleth us they are holy*. And this his exhortation (in 1 *Cor*. 14. 20.) maketh nothing for you against holy *infants*; for *Paul* doth not speake unto *Infants*, when he saith, *Brethren*, Be not children in understanding, howbeit, in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men. Now who knoweth not but that those *Saints*, who are capable to act, are to performe acts of obedience unto God: when those *Saints*, who

* 1 *Cor*. 7. 14.

who are not capable to *act*, are not bound so to doe; For (as hath been declared before) God requireth *actuall obedience* of his people, [so far as they can *act*] & no further; and so *Pauls* speech is, not to binde us to *impossibilities*, but to reach us (who have *capabilitie*) to exercise the same, to the uttermost of our power, in leaching after the mysteries of *Christ*, & in treasuring up those *divine truths*, w^{ch} are taught us by his *Spirit*. And this maketh nothing against *holy Infants* being in the *Covenant*, or *kingdome*, no more then it maketh against those aged *Saints*, who (in respect of a naturall *capabilitie*) are like *children*, and know no more then *Infants* know, nor doe no more then *infants* doe, and yet doe as much as God requireth; and in respect of a *spirituall capabilitie*, are like those *Saints*, who are capable to *act*, & doe *act* according to the same; and yet those who want that *capabilitie*, whether *Christian infants*, or other *Saints*, though the graces of *Gods Spirit* doe not appeare in them, in the *blossome*, or *fruit*, yet have they still the *sap*, and *seed* of all *Christian graces* in them.

Even as a man, or childe, which hath not the *use* or *exercise* of reason, must not be judged to be an *unreasonable creature*, & wholly destitute of reason, but a *reasonable creature*; So these (*precious Saints*) before specified, though they have not the use and exercise of the graces of *Gods Spirit*, and cannot shew forth the same in the fruit, or outward manifestation, yet they are not to be esteemed *ungracious* (or destitute of *Gods grace*), but *gracious Saints*. And though they be in *understanding* like *children*, yet (in respect of their *capableness* of the *Spirit*) they are to be esteemed as *precious* as any men on earth, and wee are not to judge otherwise, but that they shall be *glorified*, and made equall with the *Angels*, and be the *sonnes* of God in *heaven*.

Now your citation of *Pauls* words (1 Cor. 14. 20. *Be not children in understanding*, &c. to confirme what you inferred and collected from *Christs* words concerning *Infants*,) doth imply, that you doe judge that all those who are like those *Infants* in *years* or *understanding*, are not of the *kingdome* of *heaven*. And this your interpretation bringeth in three absurdities.

First, It directly contradiceth *Christs* words which he spake concerning them, and checketh him in his actions which he did to them, upon them, and for them; and so you make the words, and actions of *Christ*, both *vaine* and *frivolous*.

Secondly, Your speech implyeth, that *Believers infants* are not

of the *Heaven* of God; and so their minority hindereth their *creation*, (if they die in their *infancie*;) and this striketh at the *fundamental principles* of Gods *freedom* unto them in *Christ Jesus*.

Thirdly; in (implying, that none are of the *kingdom* of *heaven* who are like *Infants* in *understanding*.) Here I thinke you bring a *heavie* censure against your selfe; for (I suppose) as you know how soone your *life* shall be taken from you, the like you may for your *understanding*; and when your *understanding* is taken away (which may be done; and yet you may live many yeares after) how doe you differ in *understanding* then from a *childe*; Surely you are then in *understanding* like a *childe*, little *habe*, or *infant*; how then (by your *owne exposition*) will you answer the *Scripture* *Be not children in understanding*; Surely at the time when you want both *will*, *skill*, and *ability* to *act* any more then they, what are you differing from them, and wherein will your *understanding* exceed theirs?

Surely in consideration of these things, you will grant, that men, and others, that are the *true Saints* of God; may be like *children* (in *understanding*) and yet not breake their *Covenant*; but in this declining or declined condition, an *aged Saint* may (in respect) be sayd to be as defective of *understanding*, as the *parent* of a *blind* *parent*. And he may be sayd to be still *capable* of the *Spirit* (without being brought in any other *covenant* then he was in *before*) though he be not *capable* to [doe] any *spiritual* *work*, by way of *manifestation*, but God must doe all in him.

Now though there be no difference between these two, in respect of *spirituality*, yet in some respects there is a difference; The *young* is [in nature] growing upwards, or in an inclining condition. So the *seed* of *Christian* *grace* in him; the *aged Saint* before specified is in a declining condition; the *leaves* of the *tree* are fallen, and the *fruit* is gone, yet the *spiritual* *life* remaineth, &c. And the condition of the *old* man doth not so depend upon any of the *Lord* *grace*, either the *young* for their minority, or the *old* man for their *age*, or the *middle-aged* for their *bodily* *infirmities*, but to the *abundance* of according as the *blissed spirit* of God doth *work* in him, and *through* *imperfect*, as *children* they cannot *actually* and *verbally* *manifest* their *justification*, but are even as *Children* [in *understanding*].

By this glimpse, you may see, that the *Apostles* words (in 1 Cor. 14. 20. when he exhorteth us, *Not as be children in understanding*) will not beare out your childish construction of the words of *Christ*, whereby you would have us judge that he excluded infants; All which is evill in you so to think, much more to speake, and worst of all, in that you would bouldier up your opinions by *Pauls* words, in 1 Cor. 14. 20. Which maketh nothing at all for your present purpose, in your restriction and mis-application of *Christ's* words, where you thinke (through the help of *Paul* (1 Cor. 14. 20.)) to get some advantage, or plea, to keep back the holy infants of *be-leevers* from the *spirituall blessings*, which *Christ Jesus* hath testified appertaineth unto them, which you thinke did not appertaine to those infants, which *Christ* took up in his arms, and layd his hands upon, and blessed; And why doe you thus conceive? Because it is sayd of [*such*] & not off *them*.] But this word *such*, will evidently appear, (being duly weighed by the Scripture) to be of a larger extent then the word *them*, and so to include all *them*, especially considering that in all those places of Scripture where the word *such* is used, there is no exemption, either of the thing to which *such* is equalized, or coupled, for *such* implyeth the same in nature, and condition, &c.

So when *Paul* writeth to *Philemon* (Philem. 9. 10.) concerning *Onesimus*, he sayth, *Let for ladies sake Praxas, beseech thee being [such] as one as Paul the aged.* He meaneth himselfe: and when *John* sayth, *Blessed and happy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; for on such the second death shall have no power, &c.* He meaneth by [*such*] those persons who have part in the first resurrection. The word [*such*] being a general word, includeth them all. And when *Nehemiah* sayth, (Neh. 5. 12.) *Should [such] a man as I fly?* He meaneth himselfe as much as any other man.

And so when *David* sayth, (Psal. 103. 17. 18.) *The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting, upon them that feare him, and his righteousness unto childrens children [unto such as keep his Covenant]* He meaneth those that keep his Covenant, for this mercy was promised to *Abraham*, and his seed; who were to keep his covenant, by doing his commands. So God said to *Abraham*, *Thou shalt keep my Covenant [Therefore] thou and thy seed, &c.* And the keep-

Rev. 20. 6.

ing of his Covenant, consisted then, and consisteth now in the Sinner
yeelding all obedience unto him, according to their *capabilitie*. And
thus it appeareth that when David sayth to [such] as keep his Coven-
nant, he meaneth all [those] that keep his Covenant.

Divers other testimonies of Scripture concerning persons and things,
where this word *such* is mentioned, might be produced, w^{ch} doe
still include, both the former & the later, in the specification there-
of, But this may suffice, for in the mouth of two or three witnesses every
thing is established. This still giveth us more ground to beleve that
when Christ (in his Gospel) sayth (concerning infants) of *such* is the
kingdome, &c. He meaneth those who are *such* in every respect,
and as it is contrary to reason, so it is contrary to the Scripture, to
thinke that the *infants* in his speech were not implied & included,
if not principally intended.

Lastly, Whereas you say, it is meant of *such* as them in humilitie,
and *such* like qualifications; I know not from what conception you
ground your speech, if not from this consideration, that the *infants*
mentioned heer (in Christs Gospel) have *humilitie*, and *such* like
qualifications; You should know, that although *like*, is not always
the same, yet the same is the same, & is as like unto it selfe, as that w^{ch}
like it in every respect, and therefore Christs speech of *Infants*, (which
he sayth, *Of such is the kingdome, &c.*) implyeth the *infants* as well as
other Saints, who are like them in understanding, though they dif-
fer in yeares.] I say, Christs speech is not bound up from them,
nor from any other Saints, though they are like them in every re-
spect. And if they have *humilitie*, (according to your own grant)
then you may know also that God will not reject them. He hath
promised to give grace to the humble (Jam. 4. 6.) To save them (Job 22.
29.) To uphold them, (Pro. 29. 23.) And to dwell in them, (Isa. 57. 15.)
and sanctifie them, and renovate them by his Spirit. And seeing they
have *humilitie*, Christ is in them and they in him, and therefore they
are new creatures; and the *holinesse which accompanieth them (by
your own grant) giveth them right to Baptisme. And these new
creatures have new created spirits, to whom is united the Spirit of the
Creator *, and (Christ by him) quickeneth whom he will, Joh. 5. 21.
which Spirit maketh intercession for them, when they cannot
succede for themselves.

All which priviledges the *infants* of beleevers have, and though
they cannot manifest the same actually, yet we may conclude that
eternal

* 2 Cor. 5. 17.

Deut. 30. 6.

* Isa. 44. 3.

eternall life is theirs, and the second death shall have no power over them; * they are blessed and happy, having part in the first resurrection; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven; and therefore it appeareth that they are given for an heritage unto Jesus Christ, who is the way, and the truth, the resurrection, and the life, and their Physician, the graces of whose good Spirit, which is infused in them, they cannot be said to refuse, or to reject his kingdom, or any of those good things, which are distributed unto them. If the kingdom of heaven should not appertain unto the infants of believing parents, as it hath done heretofore, then the Scripture is not fulfilled, which sayth, that their children shall be as aforetime; but the Scripture is true, as God himselfe is true, and therefore your words cannot be true. God took the infants of believers into covenant with him formerly, and admitted them to be members of his visible Church then, and he caused a visible sign, and seale, of his covenant, & his righteousness of faith to be imposed upon them then, and he declared from time to time his deare love, and his tender affection w^{ch} he had towards them, and therefore they are as holy as they were, and shall be as holy as they are. Christ is a father * unto the believing Gentiles, as he was unto the believing Jewes; and he is the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever; And therefore as the infants of believing Jewes & Gentiles were received with their believing parents into the Church of God in former time; So the infants of the believing Jewes and Gentiles, are received with their believing parents into the Church of God now; and as the other had Circumcision, so these are to have Baptisme, it being given to all the members of Christs visible Church*, amongst whom they are a part*. And this is according to what is written in the Scripture of God; for thus sayth the Lord, Their children shall be as aforetime, and their Congregation shall be established before me, &c. Jer. 30. 20.

Wherefore now let us see who can give one instance, or title of Scripture, for the dismission of their membership, or for barring them from any spirituall priviledge (now under the Gospel) which they are capable off, and in particular this of Baptisme, seeing it is so generally distributed by the Lord of all administrations, and appertaineth to all Saints. Indeed if Christ Jesus had not been much displeased with his Disciples for such a thing, and if he had not declared that the kingdom of heaven appertaineth to them, and had not given a command, that they should be admitted unto him, or if he had not taken them up in his armes, and layd his hands upon them, and blessed them,

but

* Rev. 23. 6.

* Gen. 17. 11.

* Rom. 4. 11.

* 2 Cor. 6. 18.

* Gen. 17.

* Exod. 13. 48.

* Mat. 28. 19.

* Mar. 10. 14.

* Mar. 10. 14.

* Ver. 16.

Mat. 15. 26.

a Luke 18. 16.

b Gen. 17.

c Psal. 80. 11.

d & 128. 3.

e & 92. 13.

Mat. 18. 2. 3.

& 19. 13, 14,

15.

Mar. 10. 13, 14,

15, 16.

Luk. 18. 15,

16, 17.

Isa. 22. 21.

22.

23.

24.

* Heb. 13. 8.

but had despised these, and put them from him, and justified his Disciples in their rebuking of them, or if he had given the bringers of them a check, as he did to the Cananitish woman; or if he had given the least touch of holy Infants supplantation, then you might have had some matter to work upon, in this your sacrilegious opposition of holy infants. But you have no tittle of Scripture to beate you out of all the Scripture from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Revelation, maketh against you; and therefore wee may conclude against you, that the Infants of beleevers are, (now, as the Infants of beleevers were, in former time,) even subjects of Gods kingdom, members of his Church, glorious branches, young sucking-sprigs of his noble Vine, holy plants, proceeding from those Olive trees, which are planted in the house of the Lord, and are said to flourish in the Courts of our God; And what man shall root them out, without rooting out himselfe: Jesus hath honoured them greatly, and what shall be done unto those whom the King of heaven delighteth to honour? That the Lord Jesus Christ greatly delighteth to honour the Infants of beleevers, is apparently seen in these Scriptures, where Christ Jesus [now in the time of the Gospel] honoureth them so much by his words and actions. And this is that which that heavenly Prophet Isaiah (being carried by the holy Spirit of God) spake of long before, Our God, (that Father of mercies, and God of all comfort and consolation,) declared prophetically and oraculously, by Isaiah, the continuation of his truth unto beleevers, and their Infants, now under the Gospel; prophesying of Christ and of Christians, thus; He shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah; And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder, so he shall open, and none shall shut, and he shall shut, and none shall open; And I will fasten him as a nail in a sure place. And he shall be for a glorious throne unto his fathers house. And they shall hang upon him all the glory of his fathers house, the off-spring and the issue, all vessels of small quantity, from the vessels of cups, even to all the vessels of flagons, Isa. 22. 21, 22, 23, 24.

First, It is here to be observed, that Christ Jesus is called here a Father, ver. 21. He shall be a Father, (sayth he.) So [in Isa. 9. 6.] he is called the everlasting Father. Now he that is a father, must be a father of some, & whereas he is called an everlasting father, it sheweth that he is (as the Apostle sayth) the same, yesterday, today, & for ever.

Secondly, It is declared, to whom he is a father (namely) to the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah. Now the Inhabitants

ants of Jerusalem, and the house of Judah, were the Lords Saints, in covenant with him, his Church and people, of whom he had declared that Christ Jesus their Saviour should come; and these, Christ Jesus was said to be a father unto, even to the Church of the Jewes, both young and old, parents and children; and salvation was said to be of the Jewes; Their advantage was much every manner of way, first, because the Oracles of God were^b (through Christ) committed unto the; The God of their fathers^c was their father^d, and was as a nursing^e father unto them; And the same God is a father now unto the beleeving Jewes and Gentiles, as largely every way as he was then^f; The same God over all, was^g, and is, rich^h unto all that call upon him; And though some doe not beleve, it maketh not the faith of God of none effect, no more then the infidelitie of some persons then, for God was still good-unto Israel, [his faithfull Jewes and Profelytes,] that were of an upright heart, and so he is now.

Thirdly, It is said, *And the key of the house of David, will I lay upon his shoulder, so he shall open, and none shall shut, and he shall shut, and none shall open.* And the very same with this, is applyed unto Christ Jesus, as is mentioned, in Rev. 3. 7. *These things sayth he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, that openeth, and no man shutteth, and shutteth, and no man openeth, &c.* Thus through his knowledge this righteous servant is made able to justifie many; to open to whom he will, and to shut out whom he will; but he shutteth not out the infants of beleivers; for he declared, *Of such is the kingdom of God.*

Fourthly, He sayth, *I will fasten him as a nayle in a sure place;* Note here, he is said to be fastned as a nayle in a sure place;] A nayle in a sure place, is such a thing, upon which other things have dependance, so that if the nayle fall, all those things fall which are upon it; But if the nayle be sure, all those things which hang thereon, are still upheld by the strength thereof. Now the Lord Jesus Christ is this nayle, and he is strong, and powerfull, he is perfect, and pure, no sinne or brittlenesse, was found in him, he was capable to beare the burden that was put upon him, and able to beare it. Yea, and much more doth it appeare, in that he is fastned as a nayle in a sure^{*} place, his humanitie is in heaven, and there it is seated and united with his divinitie, and there is his place of rest, and abiding, he is at the right hand of God, bearing us, and yet thinketh not himselfe over-burdened; he is able to beare, and doth beare all his holy vessels, both

great,

^a Joh. 4. 22.

^b Rom. 3. 1, 2.

^c Exod. 15. 2.

^d Jer. 31. 9.

^e Num. 11. 12.

^f 2 Cor. 6. 18.

^g Psal. 86. 5.

^h Rom. 10. 12.

Isa. 22. ver. 22.

& 53. 11.

* The safenes of holy infants consisteth in the surenes of Jesus Christ; Hee is unto them, as the sure place is unto him; whose choise burden shall not be taken downe, till the time appointed of the Father;

* Isa. 59. 21.

great, and small; even the off-spring, and the issue, the vessels of small quantity; so that it is as possible to pluck God out of heaven, as to take away his former favours, which he hath extended (and doth extend) towards the faithfull, and their seed; * As for me, this is my Covenant which I will make with them, saith the Lord, the spirit, that is upon thee, and the words, that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of [Thy mouth] nor out of the mouth of [thy seed] nor out of the mouth of [thy seeds - seed,] saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.

* Psal. 122. 5.

* Isa. 11. 4.

Mat. 18. 20.

* Rev. 2. 7.

* 17.

* 28.

* 24. 16.

& 3. 21.

Revel. 4. 6. 8.

Isa. 23. ver. 24.

Fifthly, It is said, And he shall be for [a glorious throne] unto his fathers house; that is, a resting place, and a place of judgement*, & Justice, Righteousnesse is the girdle of his loynes, and faithfulness, the girdle of his reines*. And this is Christ Jesus our Lord, who doth all things by his own power, & resteth not upon any humane thing, but only upon his own divinitie, in whose name we ought to doe all which we doe; and he hath promised, upon the same, to be in the midst of us, to ratifie those divine actions, which proceed from our sincere affections; And as he hath promised the tree of life* and hidden Manna*, and morning starre*, (even his own selfe*) unto us, so hath he promised to grant us to sit with him in his throne.

Now he is not sayd to be for a glorious throne unto any, but unto his fathers house, there is this glorious throne set in the midst of the heavenly Regiment, in the midst of his Temple, there is Jesus at a throne or seate; yea, further in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, there are also the foure animals (said to be) which are full of eyes before and behinde, and rest not neither day nor night, crying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.

Sixthly, It is sayd further, And they shall hang upon him all the glory of his fathers house; Here is a weightie sentence, full of substance. This glorious throne, and holy nayle, which is fastned so surely, is done for no sleight intent, but it is for great purpose, (namely) to beare all the glorie of his fathers house: It is his fathers pleasure to exercise him, in bearing our glory, which is his glory, our brightness, which is his brightness; (for indeed wee have no comeliness but from him, and we cannot beare our selves, but he must beare us,) wee are the burden, and he is our upholder; he dependeth upon that which will not faile him, and we depend upon him, which will not faile us.

And this Angelicall patron, hath taught the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the house of Judah, (even his Church) to fasten upon him, all the glory of his fathers house. It is then an Ordinance from heaven, that

we
not
up
upo
take
sho
the
the
dren
A r
doe
him
(to
An
teac
pen
not
He
upo
the
king
I m
don
not
rish
bea
they
In
prej
bar
The
for
V
thu
exc
fath
rie,
the
the

we shall so do, as he hath sayd; And this institution therefore being not of man, but of God, it will stand, and it being an injunction laid upon us all, that wee must (both young and old) have dependencie upon this *mayle*, even the Lord Jesus, wee must doe so. Now if wee take this word [*shall*] prophetically, it being also a declaration of what should happen, (though it now be histouicall to us) wee may still see the fulfilling of it, in *Mat. 19. 13. Mar. 10. 13. Luk. 18. 15.* where the *Inhabitants of Ierusalem, and the house of Iudah* brought their children unto Christ, and he took them up and bare them in his armes; A reall signe of his love unto them indeed; And his *Saints* now doe esteem their *Infants*, blessed in Jesus Christ, and doe depend upon him, that he will *circumcise* their hearts, and the heart of their seed, (to love him more, and more,) according to his gracious promise; And this is that which this *Prophetical* and *Documentall* sentence teacheth us, when it sayth, *They shall hang* (or cause to relie, or depend) *upon him, all the glorie of his fathers house*; The least glorie must not be left out, but all must be brought in, and layd upon him. He is the *object*, upon whom they must fix their eyes; He is the *mayle*, upon which they must fasten them; for so is his *Command*, *Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdome of God.* As if he should say; *They are the burden which I must beare, because they are part of the furniture of my fathers kingdome. And those whom the father giveth me, I will not cast away. It is not the Will of your heavenly father, that any of these little ones should perish.* They are *Israelites*, the lambs of my pasture, & I am the *Shepherd* of *Israel*, and will in no wise cast them away. He sayd, *Surely they are my people, children that will not lie*, so he was their Saviour; In all their affliction he was afflicted; And as I (being the *Angel of Gods presence*) saved them, and in my love and in my pittie redeemed them, and bare them up in mine armes all the dayes of old, so will I beare them now; Therefore, *suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdome of God.*

Wherefore let all those who oppose holy infants know, that they thus far, are enemies unto the Gospel, and so doe sinne against God exceedingly, in labouring to cast out these who are the glorie of our fathers house. But the holy Prophet *Isaiah* sayth, that upon all the glorie, there shall be a covering*. Now *Infants* being part of the glorie, there is a covering upon them, and this covering, is by the Spirit of the Lord, for verification whereof, see the Evangel. *Mat. 19. 14**

Deut. 30. 6.

Mar. 10. 14.

* Mat. 18. 14

Joh. 21. 15.

Isa. 63. 8, 9.

* Isa. 4. 5.

59. 21.

* Luk. 18. 15, 16

where Christ sayth, *Of such is the kingdome of heaven*, (Mark. 10. 14.) *Of such is the kingdome of God*. And he tooke them up in his armes, and put his hands upon them, and blessed them. (Ver. 15.) And by this may appeare, that all beleeving parents have ground to cast their infants upon the Lord Jesus Christ, and for them to depend upon him, who is as a nayle fastened in a sure place.

And whereas it is sayd, [*All the glorie*,] Wee are taught not to leave out any of the glorie, least by abridging (or debarring) our Infants of their priviledges, wee leave out some of the glorie, (if not the chiefest part) and so highly disobey Gods Institution, in leaving out his ordinances, and his people, which are the glorie of his house. It is to be minded, that this word [*all*,] is agreeable to the words of Christ, when he sayth, *Of such is the kingdome of heaven*; for this word [*such*,] (as hath been observed *) is of a large extent, and includeth them also, they being the glorie of the Fathers house; So in Malachy, the seed of the godly are called, *a godly seed*, Mal. 2. 14. and in 1 Cor. 7. 14. they are rearm'd *holy children*. God greatly delighteth in them, and they are a glorie unto his Church; Wherefore they are dignified with names accordingly.

And moreover, Christ being set forth as a nayle unto these holy vessels, it doth signifie unto us, that these must be put upon him, which have not a naturall capableness, the *holy off-spring*, and *blest issue*, the vessels in Gods temple must be fastened upon* him by others.

If we compare the 17th of Genesis with this, it will give light to the poynt; for there the parents were commanded to circumcise their children, which was unto them a signe and seale of the righteousness of the same faith which Abraham had, and so it was a token that they belonged unto the Lord. And Baptisme [being unto us as Circumcision was unto them,] wee therefore baptize our infants, as they circumcized theirs; and thereby doe confirme them unto Christ, as they confirmed theirs. And because he claimeth these *holy vessels* of small quantitie, we therefore dedicate them unto him, according as God commanded the Children of Israel concerning theirs, and so we put them upon the Lord Jesus Christ; and they are his peculiar treasure, and he beareth them, and approveth of our practise in bringing them unto him, it being according to his Commandement, who is as faithful in his house as Moses, and is worthy of more glory then Moses*, inasmuch as he who buildeth the house, is worthy of more honour then

* See before in
pag. 92, 93, 99.
100.

* Not but that they are of the Temple, or members of the Church, but for more comeliness, & honour, and eminencie, safetie, glorie, and dignitie, they were appointed to be set on high (by the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, & the house of Judah) upon him, who is as a nayle fastened in a sure place.
* Heb. 3. 3.

the house. Now in this house, there the Lord hath ordained his vessels of small quantitie to abide, who are the off-spring, and the issue, and the glorie thereof. And they may well be called so, for God calleth and counteth them so. And also where this glorie is, there is still hope, and it is, and may (in reason) be expected, that as they come to be capable, so they will manifest actually the fruits of Gods Spirit; and as they are children of light, and inlightened, so they will set it forth, to the glory of the father of lights; And as glorious starres in eminencie, shew forth their excellencie, in the bright firmament of that heavenly Jerusalem, wherein they are planted, and placed, and will be also a meanes to encrease it, not onely by grafting in those farre remote, but also by propagation, (or multiplication) of persons within themselves. As Moses (that good Christian, who was like unto Christ) sayth, *The Lord make you a thousand times so many as you be.* Which speech is not to be limited to an addition of persons, unto them from out of the world, but it is meant that they should increase amongst themselves, and so multiply; even as a tree, which (though it have grafts) yet groweth into many branches, which branches are not grafted in, but spring therefrom, and grow thereupon. Now where this glorie is not, there is a want of it, yea, and a great want, I may say indeed! And why? Because that the Church then is (in expectation, according to the ordinarie course of nature) in a decaying condition. I say, the Church is readie to decay, that is to say, to be lessened more, and more, in this terrestriall habitacle; for it is appointed unto men once to die, and when they are dead, they are gone, and leave the remnant, or none behind them.

Deut. 1. 11.

But holy infants being in the Church, and members of the same, they are a glory unto it, and it may well be expected, (according to the ordinary course of nature) that they will out-live the other, and so succeed them after their decease, and so the celestially glorie of the fathers will shine in the children, (according to the minde of God) in this terrestriall world.

Now where this glorie is missing, (so that the generations in the Church doe passe away, and none are borne to succeed,) there is a want in that respect, and so consequently, the supply thereof is to be desired; which if it be made up, then it is a glory, an honour, a rejoycing unto them. So that though this hope deferred, maketh the heart sicke, yet the desire comming is as a tree of life, a reviving unto them.

Pro. 13. 12.

Gen. 4. 25, 26.

Ruth 4. 11, 12.

Isa. 29. 22, 23.

Jer. 30. 20.

Jer. 31. 15, 16,
17.

Look upon the first Church that was on earth, Adam and Eve see whether they were not comforted in bringing forth children to God; and what hope had they of the continuance of the Church on earth, if it were not by promulgation of children to their celestial Father. After Abel was slain, and Cain cast out, God sent Seth in stead of Abel; and this thing Eve did acknowledge, and this was a great comfort unto them. And thus Eve, the mother of us all, was like unto Rachel and Leah, who built the house of Israel; And how was this? Even by bringing forth a holy seed unto God, and bringing them up in his feare. And this made all the People, and the Elders of Israel, to say unto Boaz, (upon his wedding day;) The Lord make the woman that is come into thine house, like Rachel, and like Leah, which two did build the house of Israel! And doe thou worthily in Ephrath, and be famous in Bethlem. And let thy house be like the house of Pharez (whom Tamar bare unto Judah) of the [seed] which the Lord shall give thee of this young woman.

Note here, that the holy seed, the off-spring, & the issue, are materials for building the Lords house, they are the comfort of Israel, & the glory of Gods holy house, and kingdom. But where there is no off-spring, no issue, then there is not that joy, that gladnesse, that glory, that expectation of succession, as would be, if there were children. Wherefore the Lord for comforting his people Israel, sayth in the 29th of Isaiah, ver. 22, 23. Thus sayth the Lord, who redeemed Abraham, concerning the house of Jacob; Jacob shall not now be ashamed; neither shall his face now wax pale. Ver. 23. But when he seeth his children, the work of mine hands in the midst of him, they shall sanctifie my Name, and sanctifie the holy One of Jacob, and shall feare the God of Israel. Ver. 24. They also that erred in spirit, shall come to understanding; and they that murmured, shall learne doctrine. And in the 30th Chapter of Jeremiah, Ver. 20. God sayth, their children shall be as a former time, and their congregation shall be established before me, &c. And in the 31. Chapter of Jeremiah, Ver. 15, 16, 17. Thus sayth the Lord, (to Rachel, which wept for her children (from two years old and under, ((Mat. 1. 16, 17, 18.)) and refused to be comforted, because they were not) Refraine thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from teares: for thy work shall be rewarded, sayth the Lord, and they shall come againe from the land of the enemy. Ver. 17. And there is hope in thine end, sayth the Lord, that thy children shall come againe unto their own border.

Take notice heer, how the Lord comforted his people, and spake comforte

comfortably to *Jerusalem*; And he is the same unto his people, as he hath been heretofore; His comfort is not lessened, but is extended to all *Saints*, from the least unto the greatest, from the youngest to the eldest. God never lesseneth his *glorie*, nor his *excellencie*, w^{ch} he communiceth to his people, but daily increaseth his *blessings*, and multiplieth his *benefits* towards them and theirs, and increaseth their *glory*, & doth not, nor never did, diminish it from them, or their *in-*
ants. And therefore experience teacheth us, that the *infants* of the *Saints*, are the *glory* of the *fathers house*, as heretofore they have bin. Seeing then it is so cleare, that the *infants* of *beleevers* are the *glory* of the *fathers house*, they (being of his *household*) must have the *priviledges* of the *house*, according to the appointment of the *householder*; and what is appointed for such *vessells* of *honour*, and of *glory*? Surely these *holy vessells* of the *Lords sanctuary*, they being *beleevers*, and *Disciples* of *Christ*, being *hallowed* by the *holy Ghost*, ought to be *baptized*; See *Mat. 28. 19. Mark. 16. 16.*

Psal. 68. 19.

Seventhly, It is declared, what this *glory* is, and wherein this *glory* consisteth, or what must be put upon *Christ*, what *glorious things*, even the *off-spring*, and the *issue*, (sayth he) that is to say, their *seed*, or *children*; for they are the *off-spring*, and the *issue*, as may appeare by these *Scriptures*; [*Job 5. 25. Isa. 21. 8. & 48. 19. & 61. 9. & 65. 23. Rev. 22. 16. Gen. 48. 5, 6.*] And this is according to what the *Apostle* declareth in *1 Cor. 7. 14.* that the *children* of *beleevers*, (*male*, or *female*,) the *off-spring*, and the *issue*, are a *holy seed*.

Now this *off-spring*, and *issue*, hath dependency upon *Jesus Christ*, and he beareth them, and will beare them, and *blesse* them in bearing them, and *justifie* them in *blessing* them, and *sanctifie* them in *justifying* them, and *glorifie* them in *sanctifying* them; He is all in all, in them, and for them, and to them; Their *glory*, is the *glory* of his *Fathers house*, and they are the *glory* thereof, as hath been shewed before. Wherefore let all *Christian parents*, as they love *Christ*, in procreation of their *children*, dedicate their *holy off-spring*, and *blessed issue*, unto *God*, and lay them upon the *Lord Jesus Christ*, and say unto him, *Save us thy people*, (both great & small,) and *blesse thine inheritance*, *gather them*, and *lift them up* for ever.

Rom. 8. 30.

Eighthly, Further, this *holy off-spring*, and *blessed issue*, which is the *glory* of the *house* of the *God* of all *glory* and *power*, (who is the *Father* of our *Lord Jesus Christ*) are called *vessells* of *small quantitie*; *vessells* of *small quantie*, are used to be set upon *nayles* sometimes for show,

Psal. 28. 9.

show, for safetie and conveniencie, glory and decency. Now *Jesus Christ* is as a *mayle*, the *off-spring*, and the *issue*, are the *vessells* of *small quantitie*, and these *holy vessells* of *small quantitie*, *Jesus Christ* is to beare; yea, and to beare them all, [*all*] *vessells* of *small quantitie* (sayth the Text.) Wherefore wee have no ground to cast away any of them, or omit the least of these *vessells*, though they are of [*small*] *quantitie*.

Some peradventure will think, that because the *infants* of *beleevers* are *vessells* of [*small*] *quantitie*, that therefore they are [*no* *vessells*], *vessells* of [*no*] *quantitie*, or *vessells* of contempt, or disgrace, or such whom there is no *glory* *spiritually*, or such concerning whom they cannot judge, or such in whom the *seed* of *Gods grace* is not to be esteemed to be. But let them know, that they doe violent injury unto *Jesus Christ*, and doe exceedingly eclipse the *glorie* of his *mediatorship*; For as the *smallest vessells* in the *Lords Temple*, in the time of the *Law*, were as *holy* as the *greater*, though they could not containe so much; So the *Infants* of *beleevers*, (who are the *Lords vessells*) are as *holy*, as those *Saints* who are past their *minoritie*, though they being *Infants*, through tendernes of *yeares*, cannot containe or receive, what the others (who are aged) can; yet are they as precious in *Christs* estimation, and have his *holinesse* upon them, as aged *Saints* have. There was a great difference*, in the time of the *Law*, between the *spoones*, *flaggons*, and *cups*, in the *Temple*, and the *censers*, *seas*, and *potts*: and yet they were all *holy*, both *great* and *small*: and so were the *Jewes*, both *young* and *old*, *great* and *small*. *Infants* and *aged persons* they were all *holy ecclesiastically*, and all the *Lords holy vessells*; and we are not to have such *sacrilegious* thoughts as to thinke *God* doth refuse the *infants* of *beleevers*, though they are *vessells* of *small quantitie*.

* They differed in the quantitie, not in the qualitie.

Zach. 4. 10.

* In respect that there is and hath been [both by the sight of the eye, & bearing of the eare] (and in divers other respects) most of *God*, of *Christ*, and of the *Holy Spirit*, manifested in these last dayes.

The *Bowles* before the *Altar* were counted very *glorious*, when it is taken for such an excellent thing, for the *potts* in the *Lords house* to be like unto them. If then the *potts* in the *Lords house*, *spiritually* are, (in these last dayes, and flourishing times of the *Gospel*) like the *bowles* before the *Altar*; What are the *bowles* before the *Altar*? What are the *cups*? What are the *flaggons*? The *Lord* in bringing up his *holy vessells* of *small quantitie*, [even the *holy off-spring* and the *blessed issue*,] calleth them by the name of *cups*, and *flaggons*, and calleth them the *glory* of his *house*. All which doth set forth the excellency of the *Infants* of *beleevers*, their *great holinesse*, and

estimation

estimation with *Jesus Christ*. Compare with this the *Historicall Relations of Christ*, concerning infants in the *Gospel*; and there the fulfilling of this *Prophecie* will appear to be; for there they brought infants to him, that he should put his hands on them, and pray; and he approved of their act*, yea, and gave free admittance for the infants to come unto him, and charged that none should interrupt the bringers, by forbidding them; because of such is the kingdom of heaven*; and he took them up in his armes, and put his hands upon them, and blessed them**.

But to this you answer;

First, That all this is not baptizing them; for *Christ* baptized not, *Joh. 4. 2.* And therefore this place seemes not at all to prove the baptizing of Infants.

Ans. The holy Ghost fell upon *Cornelius*, and his friends, at *Peters* preaching, though all this was not baptizing them with water; yet (they being baptized by the holy Ghost) who could forbid water that they should not be baptized, which had received the holy Ghost as well as others; So the infants which *Christ* took up in his armes, he layd his hands upon, and blessed, and declared that the Kingdom of God belonged unto them; Of such is the Kingdom of heaven (sayth he) & *Christ* had declared, that without the Spirit, persons could not enter into the Kingdom of God. But these infants were subjects of his Kingdom, (according to the doctrine of *Christ*) and therefore they had the Spirit; and seeing the infants of believers are as they were, they have the Kingdom, the Gospel, the Spirit, and the graces of the Spirit, and all, and therefore they may lawfully be baptized, and therefore these places have not onely a semblance in them, but also a substantial ground for the baptizing of the infants of the faithfull; It being not various in the least, from any of Gods institutions, but every manner of way agreeable to the same. And though then neither *Christ*, nor his Spirit, baptized with the Baptisme of water, but instrumentally, yet those that have *Christ*, and the Spirit, have the inward Baptisme, and so are to have the outward Baptisme; but the infants of believers, have *Christ* and the Spirit, (for they have the Kingdom, which cannot be without the Spirit) therefore the infants of believers are to have the outward Baptisme; As hath been proved before, and even now, and shall be further cleared afterwards.

Next you say;

Secondly, Let them that please doe as here *Christ* did, yet much rather

* *Mar. 19. 13.*

* *Mar. 10. 14.*
Luk. 18. 17.

** *Mar. 10. 15.*

A. R.

Pag. 14. lin. 3.
4. 5.

Act. 10. 44.

* *Ver. 47.*

Christ did more for holy Infants, then baptize them with water.

A. R.

nances of Christ, to be the ordinances of Christ. And indeed I thinke reason should reach you, that the ordinances of Christ, are the ordinances of Christ; for as every thing is the same with it selfe, so every ordinance of Christ is the same with it selfe.

But (next you say;)

Obj. They will reply, that bread and wine received by any in such manner, and water sprinkled in the Name of the Father, &c. are his ordinances, and therefore whosoever hath these, hath his ordinance.

Ans. I thinke this your accusation, is a meer surmise, or groundlesse supposition. You say, They will thus reply; Who are they that will thus reply? I thinke you have no opposite, in withstanding this, except it be such as your selfe. This may well be called scattering; for it is the nature of chaffe, and stubble, to be scattered by the winde; and indeed, I thinke that this objection (which you make to be a reply of others) is your owne (if the truth were knowne.) And you might have saved your labour in bringing such frivolous toys. For you know, that our poynt is not concerning eating bread, or drinking wine, or sprinkling water, as they are meerly naturall acts, but as they are divine ordinances. Now to say that the eating of bread, and drinking wine, and sprinkling water, [as they are meerly naturall acts] are divine ordinances, and that therefore whosoever hath these, hath his ordinances, is very absurd. I never did heare it proceed out of any ones mouth, nor read in any book, besides your own. I conceive then that you might have saved your labour, and not made answer where there is no opposition, but have kept your Bartholomew-babies for Bartholomew-faire, unless you could have proved them to be the Kings Subjects, as the children of six moneths old are, whom you have (familiarily^a by a Supposition^b) equalized^c with them in your answer. But herein also you are deceived in your judgement, it being a very childish and babish comparison; For you might know (if you have the use of your senses) that Bartholomew-babies [of the best sort] are unsensible, but [the meanest children] (of six moneths old) are reasonable creatures, and therefore it appeareth that your unsensible comparisons are unseasonable at this time.

But the next objection being found, you cannot answer, but in labouring to turne it away, discover how deeply you are drenched in deceivable errours, and vaine conceits.

The objection or position is, that

It is said (1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.) of the children of Israel; that they were

^a Pag 16. lin. 1.

^b Lin. 2.

^c Lin. 15.

all baptized in the cloud, and in the sea; there bring young children, as well as men of yeares.

Your answer unto this is as followeth:

The Text is, that they were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea: But our question is not of baptizing unto Moses, but of baptizing unto Christ, by being dipped or buried in water by the similitude of his death, according to the institution of Christ: Thus were not these Israelites baptized, for they were in the cloud, and in the sea dry, nor was Baptisme then instituted; Thus then is the sence of the place; That no enjoying of any outward priviledge, as Baptisme; or the Lords Supper, without true faith, accompanied with obedience, will now save us any more then the many outward priviledges & visible signes of Gods presence, and the great outward deliverances which the Lord by the hand of Moses afforded and wrought for the Israelites, in bringing them through the sea, in defending and guiding them in the Wildernesse; by the cloud did exempt and save them from Gods Judgements; for notwithstanding their enjoying all these outward favours, many of them perished in the Wildernesse for their finnes and disobedience; which S^t Paul sets out as examples unto us; and therefore here by way of allusion compareth their outward priviledges, to the outward priviledges and ordinances of the New Testament; Even as S^t Peter in like manner figuratively speaketh of the Arke, 1 Pet. 3. 20, 21. When once the long suffering of God, waited in the dayes of Noah, while the Arke was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight soules were saved by water; the like figure whereunto Baptisme doth now also save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

These then being onely figures and allusions, cannot serve at all to prove the poynt in hand.

The Reply.

That the Text doth declare they were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea, is cleare, 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. And this place doth make directly against particular parts of your Judgement as your denying the Baptisme of Infants to be lawfull, affirming it to be onely a meer device and tradition of men, brought into the world for politick and by-ends*. Now here you may see who brought it into the world; I will not say God did it for politick or by-ends; for then I should be like the Serpent, which would have perswaded Eve that God [for such by-ends] did forbid them to eat of the tree of knowledge of Good and evil; thereby to possesse them with this, as though God envied their happie state. But wee know that Gods love

A. R.

Pag. 16. li. 23.

* See A. R. his first booke, in the Epistle to the Reader.

is not self-love, his end was alwayes to doe his people good at their later end; and by the baptizing of them in the cloud and the sea, he did prophetically demonstrate what should be in the dayes of the *Messias*; and herein aymed not onely at his owne glory, but at his peoples comfort.

See A. R. his
Vanitie of
Childish Bap-
tisme pag. 9.

* Excd. 14. 27,
28.

* Ver. 22; 23.

* 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.

Exod. 14. 19.

Psal. 77. 15, 16

17, 18, 19, 20.

Secondly, This place maketh against your Judgement, in your holding and seeking to maintaine a necessitie of plunging the whole man in water in the ordinance of Baptisme; for the Apostle sayth, They were all baptized in the cloud, and in the sea; But wee will not say, that they were plunged in water (or over-whelmed with the water of the Sea;) for then they would have been like unto the *Egyptians*, for the *Egyptians* were served after this manner*. Neither will wee affirme (as you doe,) that the *Israelites* were in the cloud and in the sea dry, without declaring what *drines* we meane; for though they went upon dry ground, and the waters were a wall unto them, on the right hand, and on the left*, yet wee may collect from the Scriptures, that they were baptized* with water out of the Cloud (or Sea.)

But this Text you labour to shift off, by telling us, that your question is not of baptizing unto *Moses*, but of baptizing unto *Christ*, by being dipped or buried in water, &c.

And by this it appeareth that you think this Baptisme which the Children of *Israel* received, was not the Baptisme of, (or unto) *Christ*, but meerly a Baptisme unto *Moses*. But you should know that *Moses* was not such a one as you take him to be; for he was faithfull in all his house, and brought no innovations into Gods Church. The Evangelicall Ordinances and Oracles then, were the things of God. If then they were the things of God; Gods Sonne, who was alwayes God with God, was then the owner thereof, and he being the Angel of Gods presence*, who was with them in the cloud, and in the sea, when they were Baptized*, wee may safely conclude, that the Baptisme was his, as well as the rest of the Oracles and Ordinances. And you should know, that though the manner of [Baptizing] then unto *Moses*, and now unto *Christ*, differeth in Circumstances, yet the [Baptisme] is one and the same in substance, and therefore the Apostle *Paul* telleth us, they were all [Baptized] in the cloud, and in the sea*; and he putteth no other differences between the two Baptismes, but that the one is as the other. And therefore when we speake of that Baptisme, wee cannot but speake of the Baptisme

* Isa. 63. 8, 9.

* Exod. 14. 19.

* 1 Cor. 10. 2.

of Christ; for as the Baptisme of Christ, is not the Baptisme of John, yet the Baptisme of John, was the Baptisme of Christ. So though the Baptisme of Christ is not the Baptisme of Moses, yet the Baptisme of Moses was the Baptisme of Christ; For Moses was faithful in all his house as a servant (for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken afterwards) but Christ as a Sonne, who was commended worthy of more glory then Moses; for he was the builder of the house, and therefore is worthy of more honour then the house. And seeing they were all baptized unto Moses (who was commended for his faithfulness) there is no just reason can be given to debarre the infants of believers from Baptisme now, or from being baptized unto Christ, seeing Christ is worthy of more glory then Moses, and that the Sonnes privileges are no lesse (but more) then the servants.

But you bring in exceptions against the baptisme then, and so labour to make a disparitie between the baptisme then in the cloud and sea, and this baptisme now; for you say, They were not dipt, and then yeeld this reason; for they were in the cloud, and in the sea drie. But I would know of you, how long they were drie? Surely they might be watered, and yet not be dipt. There is a Medium between being dipt, and being dry. Wee read that the children of Israel were baptized*, but wee doe not read, that they were overwhelmed, (as the Egyptians were*). But by this it appeareth, that the Scripture is of no value unto you, unless it will agree with your fond opinions; for you would argue, that because they were not dipped; therefore they were not baptized, at least, not according to Christs institution.

And afterwards you say, Nor was Baptisme then instituted. So you have answered your selfe, though it be after a written manner; If Baptisme were not then instituted, how could that Baptisme be according to the institution of Christ? though they were dipt never so much! I hope you will not say, that dipping, or plunging, maketh Baptisme any more to be of Christs institution? For then you will say, that the Egyptians were baptized according to Christs institution, and not the Israelites. But you should know, that the Israelites were not baptized contrary to Christs institution; The Angel of Gods presence was with his people then; in the cloud and in the sea, He was the Instituter.

Consider then (I pray you) what want was there of any thing needfull unto Baptisme?

a Understand heer, that I speake of the Baptisme of water; for Christ is said (by his authority) to Baptise with water, as well as with the holy Ghost & fire; and so the baptisme of water is his, whether before or after his ascension.

b Heb. 3. 2, 3:

c Ver. 5.

d Ver. 6.

* 1 Cor. 10. 2.

* Exod. 14. 28.

Ob.

Ans.

Ob.

Ans.

Ob.

Ans.

Ob.

Ans.

* Rom. 4. 11.

* Gen. 17. 11.

* Pag. 7. lin. 18.

* 1. 19. 22.

* 8. 1. 18.

* Pag. 7. 8, 9.

1. Did they want an *Instituter*?

They had him with them in the *sea*.

2. Did they want an *Administrator*?

The *Instituter* could doe it, or appoint it to be done by some other besides himselfe; But they were all *baptized* (sayth *Paul*) therefore I conclude, that seeing they had the *Administration*, it was doe without an *Administrator*.

3. Did they want the *Element*?

They had water enough in the *cloud*, and if that had been too little, there was more in the *sea*; and if the *Angel of Gods presence* (their present companion) had seen it good, they should have been dipped, and should have had as great a quantitie of the *Element* in *Baptisme*, as the *Egyptians* had without it.

4. Did they want subjects?

They were the *subjects* themselves, and *right subjects* wee may say; for they were such who were in *Gods covenant*; of which *Circumcision* (the *seale* of the *righteousnesse* of *faith*) was a *signe*.

This being rightly minded, it may refute your former opinion (to wit) that the *Baptisme* of *infants* cannot be of *God*, but of *man*, a *aine*, and *lying tradition*, thrust upon the *world* under colour, foisted in like *Antichristian devices*.

Now sure if it were not of *God*, but of *man*, you will tell us what *man* invented it. Seeing you have presumed to be so bold to goe thus far, I pray you (if you can) goe a little further, and tell us who invented it; you cited *divers humane Authors*, who were since *Christ*, but sure they were not the *inventers* thereof, for heer you may see it was administered long before they were borne, many *hundreds of years*; and so your new account commeth too short to prove the *Baptisme* of *infants* to be *invented* since *Christ*, for as much as this *Moses* undermineth that your *sandie conception*. Who invented it then? I pray you tell me, for sure you can tell; at least you thinke so, otherwise you would not have termed it as you doe. *Moses* did not invent it, he was *faithfull* over his *Masters house* as a *servant*, bringing nothing into the *worship* and *service* of *God*, but what was appointed by *God*; neither would he, or *God* suffer such a thing to be acted, and to goe unproved; except it were according to *Gods* appointment. Neither would the *Apostle* have called it *Baptisme*, if he doth in *1 Cor. 10. 1, 2*, had it been an *invention* of *man*, and not an *institution*, or an *action* of *Gods*. But you (your selfe) have granted it

to be a *priviledge* unto them; then sure you must by this confesse it was no *invention* of man, but the *Lords* doings, though it be marvelous in your eyes; and therefore seeing that the children of *Israel* (in the cloud, and in the sea) had *baptisme* conferred upon them by divine right; it was not a *humane invention*, nor *diabolicall institution* (according to your former affirmation) but an *Evangelicall Administration*.

Next you take upon you to give the *sense* of the place, but you varie from it; you tell us, that no enjoying of any outward *priviledge*, as *Baptisme*, or the *Lords Supper*, will now save us, without true faith, accompanied with obedience; and I tell you, that I also affirme the same.

But when you should declare that our *Baptisme* cannot save us without faith, no more then their *Baptisme* could save them, you varie from the *poyn*t in particular, and speake in generall of their many outward *priviledges*; and when you come to particulars, you mind their bringing through the sea for one, their defence and guidance in the *Wildernesse* by the cloud for another; but you omit their *Baptisme*, the maine thing which you should keepe to at this time, and so you run on, and would turne *Pauls* particular testimonie, into a generall; whereas *Paul* doth speake in particular, and telleth us, that they were baptized.

And at length you come to *Peter*, and take upon you to tell us the manner of his speech, how he compareth the *Baptisme* of the *Arke*, with the *Baptisme* now, and sayth, the like figure *Baptisme* doth now also save us; and so you tell us, that these being onely figures and allusions, can prove nothing to the *poyn*t in hand. Thus now you have cast off both the *Baptismes* of the *New* and *Old Testament*; for the *Apostle Peter* speaketh of the *Baptisme* of *Noah*, and of the *Baptisme* now, and sayth, this is a like figure to that, and you tell us, they are figures, and allusions; but I thinke you mean delusions; for you say, they serve not at all to prove the *poyn*t in hand.

But as for this Answer of yours, it is one and the same with that in the *Anabaptists Dialog*. For there they tell us;

1. That *Moses* did not at all wash them with water in the cloud and sea, 2. That this of *Moses* is called *Baptisme* by comparison, as *Noahs Arke* is called the figure of the *Baptisme* that saveth us: for as the *Arke* saved those in it from drowning: so the *Israelites* were all under the cloud, and in the sea, and therein baptized or safeguarded from destruction of their enemies. 3. That it pleased the *Holy Ghost* to [say] they were baptized

in the sea and cloud, because the sea and cloud was their safetie, as Noahs Arke was: And as Christ sayth, they are baptized that suffer for his sake: So there is as much warrant to enioyne Infants to suffer persecution because it is called Baptisme; as to baptisme them, because the cloud and sea is called Baptisme.

In his booke
called *A cen-
sure upon the
Anabaptists*
Dialog pa. 99.

✠
anabaptists

To this Mr. Ainsworth sayth: Let them consider Exod. 14. 24. 35. compared with Psal. 77. 16. 17. &c. And they may see there was water enough in the cloud: and they will not say (I thinke) that there was water in the sea. All outward baptizing or washing, must be with water, or some other liquor. If they were not baptized with water, with what other liquor were they baptized in? Not with blood, as in the baptism of suffering death for Christs sake, which they impertinently mention. Not with wine or strong drinke; for they found none such in the wilderness. If they can shew nothing but water to baptize them in, let them deny no more (for shame) that they were baptized with water. God spake to our fathers by the Prophets at sundry times (as in sundry parts, as it were by speciall message) as the Apostle teacheth, Heb. 1. 1. By Moses he shewed how the cloud removed from before Israel, and stood behind them, (as they passed through the Sea) and gave them light, and was darknesse to the Egyptians: and from the fiery cloudy pillar the Lord looking, troubled the Egyptians, and took off their Chariot wheelles; that they drove them heavily, Exod. 14. 19, 20, 24, 25. This being briefly and obscurely told by Moses, God after by Asaph another Prophet, sheweth the manner of it, how not onely the water of the Sea saw the Lord, when they fled and parted; but the clouds also from above poured out water when they rained; the sea sent out a sound by thunder, &c. Thus the ground being softened with the raine, occasioned the Chariot wheelles of the Egyptians (sticking in the mire) to fall off; and hinder their pursuit. Psal. 77. 16. &c. After this the Apostle (taught by Gods Spirit) manifesteth the myserie which before was kept secret, namely, how this passage under the cloud (which rained) and through the sea, was a baptism to the Israelites: even as Christian mens washings in rivers or vessels, was a baptism to them. And as the Manna which Israel eat, and water from the rock which they dranke, was the same spirituall meat and drinke, which we have signified by bread and wine in the Lords Supper, so their washing in the cloud and sea, and our washing in vessels or rivers, is spiritually the same baptism: from hence we gather the baptizing of our Infants by two Arguments:] 1. All our fathers (sayth Paul) were baptized

in the cloud and sea : therefore (say wee) Infants ; for seeing there was no other baptisme but that in the cloud and sea, such of our fathers as then were Infants, were at that time baptized, or else many of our fathers (even all the infants of many thousand families) were never baptized : which is contrary to the Apostles doctrine. And if Infants had baptisme under Moses, it cannot be denied them under Christ.

2. In that the Apostle teacheth us, that the extraordinary and temporary sacraments (or scales of salvation) which Israel had, were the substance and truth which wee now have, though Moses doth not so expresse : It followeth upon like ground, that their ordinary scales, namely, Circumcision, and the Passcover, were the same in truth and substance with baptisme, and the Lords Supper, which wee now have, and being the same ; As Infants had Circumcision then, so they are to have baptisme now.

Secondly, Whereas they say that of Moses was called baptisme by comparison, as if it were not properly baptisme : they swarve from the right way : it was as truly and properly baptisme to them, as ours is to us, though the manner of administration differ ; even as their Manna and water were as truly and properly the Sacrament of Christs body and blood to them, as bread and wine in the Lords Supper are to us. Otherwise the Apostle should not say truly, that they were the same. 1 Cor. 10. 3, 4.

Thirdly, Noahs Arke is not called the figure of baptisme, as these corrupters of Scripture tell us, but baptisme (sayth the Apostle) is a like figure (or antitype) 1 Pet. 3. 21. So that the saving by water of eight then in the Arke, was a type or figure : and the saving of a few now by water in baptisme, is an antitype, or like figure ; both of them figuring salvation by the death of Christ.

Fourthly, Neither doe these men set downe the reason fully and rightly, why they are sayd to be baptized, (namely,) because the cloud and sea was their safetie, as Noahs Arke was,) for though it may in some sense be granted, that these were their safetie, as baptisme is our safetie, (for it is said to save us, 1 Pet. 3. 21.) yet properly they are sayd to be baptized in the cloud and sea, because they were in them sacramentally washed from their sinnes, and planted together in the likenesse of his death, buriall, and resurrection, as wee are now by baptisme, Rom. 6. 3, 4, 5.

The cloud served them for three uses :

1. To protect and keep them safe, Isa. 4. 5, 6.

Q 2

2. To

2. To guide them in the way that they should goe, Numb. 9. 17. & Exod. 14. 21. And these two were ordinary.

3. To baptize them by pouring downe water, and this was extraordinary, and but one time in the red Sea, for ought wee finde. And in this respect Paul sayth, they were baptized in it.

Fifthly, Their last speech of injoyning infants to suffer persecution, as well as to baptize them, is spoken with a wry mouth: for as we injoyne not Infants to be baptized, though we baptize them, so can wee not injoyne them to suffer persecution. But this wee say and know, as Infants are baptized into Christ, so oftentimes they suffer persecution for Christ, being with their parents afflicted, imprisoned, banished, &c. yea, and bereaved of life it selfe, so that they have even the baptisme of bloud or martyrdome also.

Thus you may see, that there hath been (long agoe) a large and sufficient Answer made unto this Answer of the Anabaptists of old, which is even one and the same with yours.

Thus much for reply to your Answer to the third objection.

As touching the fourth & fifth objection (the charitable construction being set aside) I except against them both; but especially the fourth, that the outward baptisme is not needful to him that hath the other. And so for the fifth objection*, which is, that Baptisme is nothing, (though it may beare a charitable construction) yet if any conceive Baptisme is nothing, as it is an ordinance of God, they erre. Neither doe I know any one amongst all the Separation, that holdeth Baptisme to be nothing, but they reverence it as an ordinance of God.

*Pag. 17. lin. 8.

* Lin. 19.

* Lin. 26.

Christian Reader, See Mr. Henry Barrow, one of the three Martyrs (in Q. Elizabeths time,) his discovery of the false Church; for there he treateth on this particular poynt at large, and reproveth the scholasticall partie, who did labour to perswade the Queen; that seeing her Majestie had the inward Baptisme, and had done many works of mercy and pietie, that therefore shee might rest herselfe satisfied, whether shee had the outward baptisme or no: On the other hand, the Romanists said, that shee must count the Church of Rome a true Church, or else denie her Baptisme: But these were deceived, and did not consider, how that Gods ordinance is his ordinance, though in the depth of Apostacie. See the Anf. to your first Treatise. * In Pag. 14, 15, 17.

It is true [as you have granted in answering hereof*] That in some sense Baptisme is nothing, even no more was Circumcision in former time, yet as it was Gods holy ordinance, it was to be regarded as a thing of great concernment, and was not worne out then, though in the midst of Antichristianisme, or Apostasie; So Baptisme now being no less durable, though more general then Circumcision was, not lesse honourable, it ought not to be rejected but regarded, and the reverent receivers of it respected, and the contemners of it reprov'd and condemned.

Take notice heer how that in pursuing after these scattering Objections*, you have strangely varied from the poynt concerning Infants, and so

so have shot at *rovers*. Therefore I would have you (for order sake) to observe what hath been set downe by me to prove the lawfulnessse of the *Baptisme of holy Infants*, (against all your objections which you have set downe, unto this period) all which I leave to the consideration of you, and the observation others, and so proceed to answer the next which followeth.

But (say you) ² their fifth and maine [Argument] is yet behinde: from the Covenant which God made with Abraham and his seed, Gen. 17. And hence (you say) thus they reason.

As the Covenant and promises were made to Abraham, (being a faithfull man) and his seed, and thereupon all his seed were circumcised in the time of the Law, so the same Covenant and promises are made to them, being belcevers and their seed; And therefore their seed may now upon the same ground be baptized.

Ans. You have set downe an argument on your opposites part, but you have not declared (in particular) whose it is, whether you mean that the *Seperates*, or those some others, or other Churches, which you specifie (in your first part, and the beginning of this your second part) are the *Authors* hereof.

But whosoever the *Authors* are, you call this their maine argument; and it may be you count it so, because it is generally layd downe, and undistinguished; and I tell you, though the matter may be the *Seperates*, yet the forme is not, but rather your own; for it is *Ana-baptisticall* to infer, that because the covenant and promises were made to *Abrahams seed* before the Law, that thereupon all his seed were circumcised in the time of the Law; if by [all] you mean all his seed by generation after the flesh; for then it will follow, that all *Ismaelites*, and *Edomites*, were circumcised, and all other *Apostates* of *Abrahams seed* by generation, besides the rest of his seed: But wee doe affirme, and will prove, that as *Abraham* had no command to Circumcise all Nations (or seeds, or any *Apostate* whatsoever, though the off-spring of his body) but those that were the seed in covenant with God; so the *Saints* of God, which continued in that estate wherein God had set *Abraham*, were to circumcise none but such as they were; yea, in this respect, the infants of the *Profelytes* were preferred before the infants of the *Apostate* seed of *Abraham*; and therefore you may see that wee are far from affirming that any *Apostate* that sprung from the loynes of *Abraham*, [(was, much lesse that all were)] to be circumcised; for

* Pag. 18. at
lin. 2.

* Gen. 17. 11.

Apostates whether they were of *Abrahams* loynes or not, they were all visibly in a bad condition, and not to have the *signe* (or *seale*) of *Gods* covenant put upon them; And those who were not *Apostates*, whether *Jewes* or *Profelytes*, they were all visibly in a good condition, and were to have the *signe* and *seale* of *Gods* covenant administered upon them, and were different, and quite contrary to the *Apostates*.

By true *Jewes* and *Profelytes* and true *Christians*, I mean visible *Saints*.

Therefore (to keep to the matter in hand) the Argument for the *Infants* of *beleevers* lieth thus; That as all the *infants* of the true *Jewes* and *Profelytes* were to have the *seale* of *Gods* covenant put upon them then, so all the *infants* of those who are true *Christians*, ought to have the *seale* of *Gods* Covenant put upon them now.

See *Gal.* 3. 17, 18. and compare herewith the words of *Peter*, *Act.* 2. 39. The promise is unto you, & to your children, &c.

And seeing the Covenant was (confirmed of *God* in *Christ* four hundred and thirtie yeares before the *Law*) and was established with *Abraham*, and all his seed, who did not degenerate, and thereupon they were all to be sealed unto him (as his peculiar treasure) with that *signe* (or token of his covenant) which he had appointed then. It followeth that now the same covenant is confirmed of *God* in *Christ*, and made sure unto all faithful parents, and all their seed, who doe not degenerate, and therefore they may all be sealed unto *God*, (as his peculiar treasure) with the *signe* (or token of his covenant) which he hath appointed now.

It followeth also that [*Baptisme* being the *seale* of one and the same Covenant, which *Circumcision* was a *seale* of,] it ought to be administered upon the *infants* of *beleevers* now, as *circumcision* was formerly; because that the *infants* of *beleevers* being formerly in the new Covenant, of which *Circumcision* was a *signe*, are not rent out of it by the coming of *Christ*, but confirmed in it; for *Christ* is no changing, and therefore *Baptisme* being now the *seale* of the same Covenant, it admitteth of the same subjects, and it being not more particular, but more generall then *Circumcision*, and to be administered upon male and female, it appertaineth to the *Infants* of *beleevers*, both male and female. And this is according to that teaching Oracle, which *God* did in the cloud, and in the sea, in which the whole body of the *Israelites* were baptized, both male and female.

Pag. 18.

But you say, That neither *Abraham* nor his seed were circumcised, because the Covenant was made with him: and your reason is, because the Covenant was made with him above twentie yeares before *Circumcision* was instituted. And yet all this time neither *Abraham* nor his seed were circumcised; neither had he or any of his seed ever been circumcised, for his

his being in the covenant, had not the Lord afterwards expressly commanded the same.

To which I answer, that though they were not circumcised so soone as they were in the covenant, neither commanded to be circumcised then, yet if Abraham had not been in the covenant, neither he nor his infants could have received the ordinance of Circumcision, the signe of the covenant, according to Gods appointment. But beleivers and their seed that came after, were not to omit circumcision; for if they did they brake the covenant. Now Abraham & his seed by vertue of Gods covenant, were bound to yeeld obedience to God, and to walke in all his wayes, as God revealed himselfe unto them; So that when once Circumcision was instituted, it was not to be omitted.

Next * you say;

Nor was that covenant made with Abraham and his seed, meerly for his being a faithfull man (for then should it have been made, with Noah being a faithfull man) but for his being such a faithfull man, whom the Lord pleased to choose, and set out as a patterne to all beleivers, Rom. 4. 23, 24. and to be a father of many Nations, Rom. 4. 17, 18. And in whose seed all the Nations in the world should be blessed, Act. 5. 25. & 13. 23. (to wit) in Christ, who was to come of his flesh.

Ans. The same new covenant that was made with Abraham, was made also with Noah; wherefore as Abraham is called the father of many Nations, so Noah is called the heire of justice, which is by faith; Such a faithfull man as Abraham was, such a faithfull man was Noah; yea, chosen of God, and a patterne to all beleivers which should come after him.

Now whereas you say, that the Lord was pleased to choose Abraham, and set him out as a patterne to all beleivers; I suppose you meane all those beleivers which came after him, not those that were dead before he was borne; So Noah was a patterne to Abraham, not Abraham a patterne to Noah.

And it is sure that Abraham was a father of many Nations, and so was Noah; and that not onely according to the flesh, but also spiritually; He was a father of many Nations according to the flesh, because he was the father of Abraham*, who was the father of many nations according to the flesh. Spiritually, Noah was the heire of justice, and Abrahams father, as Abraham is sayd to be our father, and the father of all those who walke in his steps. And seeing that Christ came of Abraham, and Abraham of Noah, therefore Christ came of Noah, so that

it

See Gen. 17.

Exod. 4. 24, 25;
26.

A. R.

* Pag. 18. 36
lin. 17.

Heb. 11. 7.

* See Luk. 3.

it may be sayd (in this respect) of Noah, as of Abraham, that his seed (which is Christ) all the Nations of the earth are blessed.

Further you say *;

Therefore although the Covenant and promises were made to Abraham and his seed, yet the consequence will not follow, that the covenant is likewise made with all beleivers and their seed; for beleivers onely are the seed, and the seed onely, and none of them a father in the Gospel sence, nor any other save onely Abraham, to whom and his seed the covenant and promises are made.

Ans. That the covenant and promises were made to Abraham and his seed, you cannot denie; that the Profelytes and their seed were heires of the same covenant, as well as Abraham and his seed, the Scriptures are cleare, Gen. 17. 9. 12. Exod. 12. 48. Isa. 56. So when Zachens beleaved, and so became the sonne of Abraham, he had the same priviledges which Abraham had, namely, that the same time salvation was come to his house *. Therefore seeing that he was the sonne of Abraham, his infants were in the covenant of Abraham. And this is according to what the Apostle sayth, Gal. 4. 28. Now wee brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise; if now the brethren are, as Isaac was, then their Infants are as Isaacs infants were, and are to have the same priviledges of the covenant as Isaacs infants had; But the former is true, from the Apostles Testimony, and therefore the latter is true also. And therefore [Baptisme being one of the priviledges of the covenant of God] which they are as capable of as of circumcision they ought to be bapized, as Isaacs infants were to be circumcised.

And seeing the same Covenant which was made with Abraham was made with Isaac and his seed, and that beleivers are (as Isaac was) the children of promise. The consequence then, that the covenant is likewise made unto all beleiving parents, and their holy seed, is very true.

Whereas you tell us that Beleivers onely are the seed, and the seed onely, and none of them a father in the Gospel sence, nor any other save onely Abraham. I tell you, that if Abraham had not been a beleiver, he could not have been the seed, much lesse a father spiritually, unto those who walke in his steps; neither could Isaac the childe of promise have been as he was.

2. Though Christ is the root of David *, yet he is also the off-spring of David *, so is he the root, and the off-spring, the father * and the sonne of Abraham *, so that Abraham was Christs seed spiritually, as all the Profelytes were, and in this respect Abraham is our brother.

A. R.

* Pag. 18. at
lin. 24.

* Luk. 19. 8, 9.

* Rev. 5. 5.

* Rev. 22. 16.

* Joh. 8. 58.

* Mat. 1. 1.

But you tell us, *Beleevers onely are the seed, and the seed onely, and none of them a father in the Gospel sence, save onely Abraham*; but you should know, that *Noah was Abrahams father*, both *spiritually* and *temporally*, and a *beleever*, and so were the holy *Patriarkes* before him, therefore they were the *seed*, and yet wee will not say they were the *onely seed* in the largest extent, for I thinke that all the *Saints*, which are, or have been, are not yet the *onely seed*, for there are no doubt many yet to come. Now if by the *onely seed*, and the *seed onely*, you mean that *God* never accepted of any *seed*, but such as they were *spiritually*. I grant the same; that such are the *seed* indeed and in truth; and such a one was *Isaac* in his *infancie*, and such are the *Infants* of *beleevers* now, as those *infants* which *Christ* took up in his *armes*, and layd his hands upon and blessed. And though the *infants* are not *fathers*, but faithfull children of the faithfull, yet they have the blessing of *Abraham*, which lighted upon *Isaac* in his *infancie*; and those that are blessed with faithfull *Abraham*, are the seed of *Abraham*, and children of the promise; but the *infants* of *beleevers* are blessed with faithfull *Abraham*, therefore they are the children of the promise.

Moreover, You should not be ignorant, that *Enoch, Noah, Sem, Abraham, Isaac*, and divers others, were *fathers spiritually*. But you would have *Abraham* to be the *onely father*; for you say, *None of them is a father in the Gospel sence, save onely Abraham*; so that you exclude all *beleevers* from the *beginning* unto this present, (yea, to the end of the world,) from being *fathers* any of them in the *Gospel sence*; But you should know, that all *beleeving fathers*, who have holy children, are *fathers* in the *Gospel sence*; and as they are holy, so are their *infants*, who have no more childrē, then *Isaac* had in his *infancie*, yet seeing they are heires of the *Covenant*, w^{ch} was made with *Abraham*, they have his blessing. So *Paul* termeth the children of *beleevers* *holy* *; and so *Peter* sayth, *The promise is unto you, and to your children*, * *1 Cor. 7. 14.* &c. which implyeth *fathers*; and surely I thinke this is *Gospel sence*, * *Act. 2. 39.* if not *Gospel* it selfe.

Further you say;

Wherefore to affirme that every *beleever* hath now the same *Covenant* and promises made to him and his seed, as *Abraham* had to him and his seed, is very absurd; and is all one as to say, that now every *beleever* by his *beleeving* doth immediately become a father of the faithfull as well as *Abraham*.

To which I answer as before, that *beleevers* are in the same *Covenant*,

R

A. R.

Page. 18. at
lin. 30.

Abraham so-
journd in the
land of Canan
as a stranger,
but his seed
did inherite it,
yet the promise
of salvation
was equally
made both to
him and his
seed, as it is
to us and our
seed.

2 Lin. 35.

Lin. 36, 37;
38, 39.

nant, and therefore both they & their seed, have the same priviledges
of the Covenant, as the Profelytes and their seed had in former time.
And you should know, that Abraham was not the father of Noah,
but Noah was the father of Abraham, and he was before Abraham,
and therefore was not onely the father of Abraham, but also the fa-
ther of all beleevers after him spiritually. Now though Abraham was
not the father of so many beleevers as Noah was father of; yet Abra-
ham had the same priviledges in respect of the new covenant as Noah
had: So Jacob, though he was not the father of so many beleevers as
Abraham was father of, yet had he the same priviledges, (in respect of
the new covenant) as Abraham had. I will not say, that Abraham
had the same outward temporall priviledges w^{ch} Noah had, for Noah was
the father of all Nations according to the flesh, though not the father
of Caine, or those before him; neither will I say, that Jacob, or Isaac
had the same outward temporall priviledges in every respect as Abra-
ham had, for Abraham was the father of the Ismaelites and Edomites
after the flesh: And yet this doth not prove, that every beleever upon
his beleeving, doth become a father of the faithfull; no more than I-
saac, who was a father of the faithfull as well as Abraham.

And seeing your demand*, Where any seed are, [if] all be fathers,
is grounded upon an [if] or supposition, that all are fathers; let it be
a supposition still, and so (upon this ground) when you bring suppo-
sitions (without distinctions) builded upon your own imaginations,
and prosecuted with such groundlesse cavillations, you may expect
that your building will fall to the ground, as this doth.

To your affirmation, That their seed, and their seeds seed are all mem-
bers of the Church, and so to be accounted faithfull, and so to be all fathers
of the faithfull as well as Abraham, from generation to generation to the
worlds end.

I answer, That the infants of the faithfull, are all members of the
Church; and they are not to be accounted unfaithfull, though they
die in their infancie; And seeing Gods kingdome belongeth unto children,
though they have no children, nor are fathers of the faithfull as Abra-
ham was, yet they have the same precious priviledges, as Abrahams in-
fants had; So that they are to be esteemed, now, to be the sons of God,
and yet it is not manifested what they shall be, when their terrestriall bo-
dies (being made like the glorious body of their sweet Saviour) shall
shine celestially in the kingdome of Eternitie.

Next you would make us beleeve, that you will expresse your selfe

more plainly, (and in the intrin you promise this truth) That there is now no difference between any circumcision or uncircumcision, Jew or Gentile, bond or free, male or female, but all are one in Christ Jesus, Gal. 3. 28.

And to this I answer, that Gal. 3. 28. doth not prove, that you have performed what you promised, and called a truth; for as you have layd it downe, it is an untruth, namely, that there is no difference between [any] Circumcision, or uncircumcision, &c. In this you have done evill, and in fathering it upon the Apostle Paul, you have done worse; for Paul is no patron of this opinion, it was no part of his doctrine, that there is no difference between [any] Circumcision, or uncircumcision, &c. But he putteth a manifest difference between Circumcision of the heart, and Circumcision of the flesh; as also between Jew and Jew; namely, he that is a Jew outwardly onely, and he that is a Jew inwardly; as also he putteth a difference between Gentile and Gentile, namely, an unbelieving Gentile, and a beleeving Gentile. So that Paul maketh the beleeving Gentiles, and the beleeving Jewes, all one in Christ, and not beleevers and unbelievers all one in Christ, for he applieth his speech to the Saints onely. So that it appeareth you have quite mistaken the Apostle, yea, there is no Scripture which will beare you out in this your absurd affirmation.

And now I will come to what you call your plaine expression, which is that;

If every beleever by his beleeving doth become a father of the faithfull as well as Abraham, then it must be at the very instant of his beleeving that he doth become a father of the faithfull as well as Abraham, and if so, where then will be any children to all these fathers; for none can be children before they be faithfull; and also at the same instant cease to be children, and become fathers, which implyes a flat contradiction, and then how can Abraham himselfe be father of all beleevers, Rom. 4. 11, 12.

Ans^r. Who doth affirme, that every beleever doth immediately become a father? That which you say implyeth a flat contradiction, I thinke is builded but upon a supposition of your owne, as if they should affirme, that beleevers upon their beleeving, at the same instant cease to be children, and become fathers! And then upon this you aske how Abraham himselfe can then be father of all beleevers? Which interrogation of yours implyeth rather a flat contradiction of the Scriptures of God; as if Abraham was not both sonne and father.

1. A sonne of Noah he was, as wee are the sonnes of Abraham by

R 2

faith

Lin. 40.

Pag. 19. lin. 1, 2.

Rom. 2. 28, 29.

A. R.

Pag. 19. at lin. 3.

Pag. 19. lin. 7.

Isaacs fatherhood made him not cease to be Abrahams child, no more then our fatherhood doth make us cease to be his children.

faith in Christ. 2. A father of the faithfull he was also : So that Abraham was both a sonne and a father.

* Lin. 9.

You doe not explaine your selfe, when you aske how Abraham himselfe then can be father of all beleevers? for you may know that Noah was father of more beleevers then Abraham, & Noah himselfe was a beleeve before Abraham, And if Abraham was not his father, then he was not a father of all beleevers who went before him.*

But it may be you meane, by all beleevers, all that came after Abraham, and walked in his steps; for if you mean by all beleevers, all that ever have been, are, or shall be, then by your owne ground, there were no beleevers before Abraham was a father, or else you must confesse, that Abraham was not a father of them. But there were beleevers before Abraham was borne, and beleevers there were, and are after him, therefore Abraham was, and is, both a father of some beleevers, and a childe of other beleevers, as wee are the children of him, if wee derogate not from his steps; and are the fathers of our posteritie (after the flesh) who doe not aberate from Gods commandements.

Next you say;

Or how can the promise be sure unto all the seed, if beleevers children be the seed, for they will not affirme that all their children are saved. But this is affirmed of all the seed to whom the promise is made, Rom. 4. 16. Heb. 6. 16, 17.

Ans. You thinke if beleevers children be the seed, the promise cannot be sure to all the seed! and why is this? your reason is, for they will affirme, that all their children are not saved. But if this be a sufficient reason to prove infants not to be in the promise, then it will prove that their parents are not in the promise, nor any other, and so upon this ground you must baptize none at all, nor judge any to be in the promise, though they professe faith never so much, sith that many who are members, and make a verball profession, and ought to be baptized by Christs rule, fall back, like Judas Iscariot, and Simon Magus.

But you should rather have questioned thus (according to truth) how can the promise be sure to all the seed, if beleevers infants be not in the promise?

And surely, wee are not to argue so perversly, and foolishly, that because [some] beleevers children are not saved, (since they rent themselves out of the promise) that therefore [no] beleevers children, or that their infants are not in the state of salvation, and that the promise

promise appertaineth not unto them; for this will not stand with true sense or reason, nor with the *Apostles Testimonie*, when he sayth, *Rom. 3. 1, 2, 3.* That the *Jewes advantage was much every manner of way*, and that the unbelieve of some, did not make the faith of God without effect. So that the *Apostle* himselfe answereth your objection; for the promise is still sure unto all that abide in Gods Covenant.

And seeing the infants of beleeving parents doe abide in Gods covenant, they are part of all the holy seed, and therefore it evidently appeareth, that the promise appertaineth unto them, as hath been proved before; and this doth as really appertain unto them, as to those who professe faith, and those that deny this, doe in a manner make the faith of God of none effect, and so make the Author thereof a liar.

But let such despisers of the children of promise, wonder and perish, without the promise, rather then that the Infants which God hath given to beleeving parents, should not be counted for the seed, within the promise.

But next you say;

Now then, if the promise be sure unto all the seed unto whom it is made, and all beleevers, and onely all beleevers the promise is sure to: Then all beleevers, and onely all beleevers are the seed unto whom the promise is made, and then none of Abrahams own naturall seed, nor the naturall seed of any other in the world, are to be accounted the seed, unto whom the promise and covenant is made, untill they beleeve, *Rom. 9. 7, 8. Rom. 4. 13, 14. Gal. 3. 7, 9.*

Ans. It is a sure truth, that the promise is sure to all the seed to whom it is made, and it is made to the faithfull, and their seed, that doe not degenerate from their steps. But their Infants cannot justly be said to degenerate from the steps of their holy parents, who continue in their righteousness; Therefore they are holy, and in the Covenant, and are the children of Abraham. And seeing you have granted that all beleevers, and onely all beleevers are the seed unto whom the promise is made, then all those to whom the promise is made, are the seed, and so are beleevers; but the promise was made unto Abrahams infants, as well as to others: God said unto Abraham, that he would be their God; and for confirmation of his Covenant, he ordained that the infants should have the signe of his covenant, the seale of the righteousness of his faith in their infancie. And the like may be sayd concerning the Profelytes, and their infants, for God was a God unto them all,

A. R.

Gen. 17.

both *male* and *female*, *bond* and *free*. And the like may be sayd now concerning *beleevers*, and their *infants*, for *Christs love* is not lessened since he manifested himselfe in the *flesh*; He is the same as he *was*, and will be the same as he *is*, in this respect; and therefore seeing wee have not one tittle of *Scripture* for debarring our *infants* of the *priviledges* which formerly appertained to the *infants* of the *faithfull*, wee ought not so to shut up the *kingdom of heaven* against them, but ought to beleeve that the *blessing of Abraham* belongeth to them, as well as to the *infants* of *old*; for it is a sure truth, that the *promise* is *sure* unto them, and therefore the *scale of the promise* must be imposed upon them.

Now whereas you say, that *none are to be accounted the seed, till they doe beleeve*; If by *believe*, you mean *believe* by manifestation, actually, in their own persons; What is this but an arguing against *Isaac* in his *infancie*? and a shutting him out (in your conceptions) from being then a *childe of promise*, and a shutting out of others also, who were as holy as he, & yet could not manifest *faith* actually in their own persons, no more then he could in his *infancie*. And so if you mean that *none are the seed, untill they do professe faith* (as it appeareth you do) is not this to make voyd the *promise of God*, in shutting out all *Abrahams infants*, and the *infants* of all other *beleevers*, and thus (through their sides) to strike at *Christ*, who was once an *infant* like them?

Now the thing which you should mind (but doe not) is that the *Covenant* was established with *Abraham* and his *seed* everlastingly; with his *infants*, as well as *others*. And as wee may say concerning *Abraham*, and his *infants*, so wee may say concerning the *Profelytes* and their *infants*; and the like may be sayd for *beleevers*, and their *infants* now, whom you can never prove to be out of *Covenant*, till they appear to be *seeds*; and then do your best; but so long as they are not *degenerated*, but remaine the *seed*, they are to be accounted *holy*, and within the *promises*, and *covenant* of the *Gospel*. And as for the *holy infants*, I know not how they can be charged with *unbelieve*, or *disobedience* against any of *Gods Commandements*, any more then their *holy parents*, to whom the *Lord* hath testified, saying, that he sheweth *mercy to thousands of generations of those that love him and keepe his Commandements*.

Next you say;

This then being a most evident truth, it may in no wise be granted, that the *covenant* is made with all *beleevers*, as with *Abraham*, or that
the

the promise is made unto all these, as unto Abraham, or that all these are fathers as Abraham, for all these are the seed, and the only seed and children of Abraham: And those to whom the covenant and promises doe onely belong under the tearme seed.

Ans. These your words doe imply, that Abraham was not any part of the seed, and that the covenant was not made unto him as he was a beleever, but meerly as he was a father. But when God made his Covenant with him, He did not say, I will be thy God meerly as thou art a father, and the God of thy seed, meerly as they are thy seed, and of thy seeds-seed, meerly as they are thy seeds-seed; but he testifieth that he will be the God of him, and them, though he and they should increase to many persons, yet he would be a God unto them all; as he was a God unto him; God was a God unto Isaac, and he was a God unto Abraham, and he could be no more unto him. What could Abraham have more then God? a greater reward he could not have, then the reward that exceeded all rewards. Now God hath covenanted with his people, that he will be their God, and therefore it appeareth, that the covenant is unto them, as it was unto Abraham; And so it was with the Profelytes, & their seed, as with the Jewes, and their seed.

And though this be a most evident truth, yet you say, it may in no wise be granted, that the Covenant is made with all beleevers as with Abraham; yea though they have the like spirituall priviledges, as Abraham had; yet you resolve, not to grant it, and it is not materiall whether you grant it or no.

Now that they are all fathers, as Abraham was, I will not take upon mee to prove, but this I know, that they are in the same covenant, and have the same spirituall priviledges, w^{ch} Abraham had. As for your affirmatton, that all these are the seed, and the onely seed, and children of Abraham; For explanation, I answer as before, that if Noah was Abrahams father, Abraham was not his father, and therefore Abraham was not the father of all those beleevers that were before he was borne; for Noah (Abrahams father) was a beleever. And to this agrees your owne words, for you say, beleevers are the seed; yea, all beleevers, and onely all beleevers, are the onely seed, and the seed onely, and therefore you may see that Abraham, though he were a father, yet he was part of the seed; for I thinke you will not deny him to be a beleever.

Whereas you say, that if it were otherwise, then must they be comprehended,

prehended, (Gen. 17. 7, 8.) under the tearme thee, and then the rest of the phrase (to wit) and to thy seed, would be in vaine, and superfluous, which to thinke were very irrationall.

Act. 2: 39.

I answer, That this which you have sayd will not stand with reason; for you should know, that if the covenant did appertaine to Abrahams seed, in no wise, as to Abraham, then the rest of the phrase, (to wit) and to thy seed, would be in vaine and superfluous, w^{ch} to thinke would be very irrationall indeed. And the like wee may say concerning Peters application of the promise unto beleevers and their children, that if it is bound up onely in the parents, then Peter might have rested at those expressions concerning the parents particular persons, and onely have sayd thus; the promise is unto you, and not have added these words, and to your children.

Abundance of testimonies of sacred Scripture might be cited, where the seed and generation of the faithfull are declared to be in the promise with their parents, but this may suffice which hath been spoken, that wee may not exclude the holy off-spring, and blessed issue of the blessed; but whensoever wee happen upon any such place of Scripture, where the seed is said to be in the blessing with the parents, (especially, considering that the Scripture affecteth brevity) wee ought then to mind, that if the blessing be bound up from the infants in the parents, then the words are in vaine and superfluous, where their children, seed, off-spring, and issue, are mentioned.

But seeing that the promise to the seed, is not vaine nor superfluous, nor ever was, it is irrationall to thinke, that God is not the same God in extending his grace and mercy to the seed of beleevers, as to themselves.

Lin. 32.

Next you say;

Put the case it be granted them to be fathers, as they doe desire to be like to Abraham, then must they be fathers of onely such as beleeve, and not untill they beleeve; for according to the tenor of this new Covenant, and in the Gospel sense, Abraham himselfe is father of none other, nor otherwise.

Ans. Though in some respects we desire to be fathers, as Abraham was, yet far be it from us, to desire to be fathers as he was in every respect. You shall not father such a thing upon us. Wee desire to be fathers as Abraham was (though not in every respect) and it is lawfull for us so to do, yea, our duty, not only to desire it, but to strive to imitate Abraham, in instructing our families, and teaching them the way of life, according as every one of them is capable to receive instruction.

on. But though some of our children doe degenerate, as some of *Abrahams children* did, yet it maketh not the promise uneffectuall to the rest, no more then it did to the rest of the children of *Abraham*, who was a father of them in the Gospel sence; as wee are fathers of these, our children, who abide in our righteous steps.

And wee are fathers of our own infants, otherwise then wee are of the unbelieving *Jewes* and *Turkes*; for ours wee know are in the covenant, but the other wee know are not, untill they doe believe. But when they doe believe, then have they as great priviledges for their infants, as *Isaac* had for his infants, And these are, as those were, and therefore as it was warrantable for those to be sealed then, so is it warrantable for these to be sealed now.

But hence you affirme;

That Publicans and Harlots may be the seed, and have as much right to Baptisme, as any believers seed, or as any of Abrahams owne naturall seed; for all and every of these, must first repent, and then be baptized, A& 2. 38.

Ans. If this be forcible against *believers infants*, it is of force against themselves, and if such a reason could have bin strong against *Abrahams infants*, then against *Abraham* himselfe; for the *Heathens* then might become converts as well as now.

Moreover, I tell you, that it is not to the poynt for us to look what persons may be, or may have right unto, but what persons are, or must be judged to be, and what they have right unto; and therefore this position of yours is very impertinently brought against *Infants* right to the covenant, or *Baptisme*, especially considering that the infants of *believers* are neither *publicans* nor *harlots*, nor to be ranked with them, or their infants, till the *publicans* and *harlots* cease to be so; and God create in them a new spirit, as he doth in the infants of the faithfull; and so circumsise their hearts, and make them new creatures, and give them the same blessing which *Christ* gave unto the *Israelites* infants, whom he took up in his armes, and imposed his hands upon and blessed.

Whereas you further adde, that

Upon the same tearmes may any, yea, the most wicked in the world, and their seed be baptized.

Ans. It is true, that the infants of those who are penitent, and in Gods covenant, though they were formerly wicked, are to be baptized as well as their parents. But note this, that *Baptisme* is a confirmation of

A. R.

* Pag. 20. at
lin. 4.

of their being in Covenant, as Circumcision was to Abraham, and his infants, and to the Profelytes, and their infants.

Touching your reason for this which you annex* (to wit) that the partition wall is now broken down, and that the Gospel knows no difference between any; but is to be preached to every creature in the world, and so you cite, Mar. 16. 15, 16. Mat. 28. 19. Gal 6. 15. & 8. 29.

I answer, That though the former position be true, yet this reason brought to confirme it is impertinent, considering that the Profelytes, and their infants [in former time] were received into Gods covenant, to whom salvation was not denied then, though Christ were not manifested in the flesh, nor the Gospel published unto all Nations, as now since, by Christ it was commanded to be.

And as for the Scriptures cited by you, they make much for believing parents, and their infants; for as much as the application of the Gospel appertaineth unto them all. In Mar. 16. 15, 16. the Gospel is commanded to be preached unto [every] creature; and it is said, that Whosoever beleeueth and is baptized, shall be saved; and Whosoever beleeueth not, shall be damned*. And in Mat. 28. 19. Goe make all Nations Disciples (sayth Christ) baptizing them. As if he should say, in former time I bound my selfe to one Nation, and published my name unto them, but now I stretch forth my hands further, that all Nations might be made Disciples, and baptized, as that one nation of the Jews were made Disciples and circumcised.

Now sure as we cannot justly deny the infants to be creatures, to whom salvation or damnation appertaineth, so we cannot deny that the Gospel appertaineth unto the infants of beleevers (as well as to their parents) though they die in their infancie, or that the holy infants are Disciples inclusively with their parents, as they have been heretofore.

If then infants are included in the generall Commission (as doubtless they are) then they are not to be excluded; but the infants of beleevers are admitted by God to come into the Church with their parents, according to the ancient custome, which was very profitable and comfortable, and no dishonour to God, nor discredit to his cause, nor hinderance to his people, but a glory unto his house, they being pure vessels, which he prized at such a high rate, as to send his begotten Sonne into the world to take upon him the nature of them, and to suffer for them, and to make them new creatures, such as are mentioned in Gal. 6. 15. which awaiteth with God, when neither

* When Christ sayth, He that beleeueth and is baptized, shall be saved, He no more intendeth to exclude the infants of the faithfull from Baptisme, then from salvation: but those that exclude them from the Covenant, doe as much as in them lieth, to exclude them from both.

Circum

Circumcision, nor *uncircumcision* doth; therefore they are not *excluded* from the generall Commission.

Moreover, *Christ* hath declared them to be his, by blessing them, and testifying that they are of his *kingdome*; and seeing then, that they are *Christs*, they are *Abrahams seed*, and *heires* according to promise, Gal. 8. 29. and have interest into this *grace* wherein they now are, so that they cannot be deprived of their *inheritance*, no more then those who *professe faith*, and doe act that which these *Infants* have not a naturall capablenesse to doe.

As touching your demand * (which you say is demanded in *coole blood*) how wee doe become *Abrahams seed*; you have testified what wee will say, * (which may be stood to without danger,) namely, that wee become *Abrahams seed* only by *faith* *.

* Lin. 13.

* Lin. 14, 15.

* Imputatively
* Lin. 15, 16.

As for the inference * (which you bring upon it,) that *so must* our children by the same way; wee grant the same, it is one of our principles; as also, that there is (as you confesse) but one seed, and no more in the sense and acceptation of the Gospel.

Next you say *.

They further reason from the equitie of *circumcision* thus:

As infants then by Gods allowance, received that *seale* of the covenant, so by proportion why not this now of *Baptisme*.

* Pag. 20. 21
lin. 18.

And in answer hereunto you rehearse * Gods commandement to *Abraham* concerning *circumcision*, and say, That it was both right & equall that *Abraham* should doe herein as God had commanded him, and it had been sinfull for him to have done otherwise, more or lesse: And so likewise it is right for us to doe as God hath commanded us to doe, and no otherwise.

* Lin. 21.

To which I answer, that Gods *divine institutions* are full of equitie, and there is no iniquitie in them, nor in any thing which he doth, and God not only allowed but strictly commanded *Abraham* to *circumcise*, and without the command (or institution) he was not to put the same in execution. But when once *Circumcision* [the signe and seale of the righteousness of faith] was instituted, then it was to be administered; and this was right and equall, and allowed of by God.

* Mr. Spilsbery
granteth, that
the matter of
Gods worship
is not changed
at the coming
of Christ in the
flesh. See his
Treat. Bap.
pag. 19 lin. 15.

Now it remaineth for you to prove (if you can) when the substance * of this institution was taken away.

Peradventure you will say, that the institution of *Baptisme* hath put anullitie to the seale.

I answer, That the enlargement of a thing, or taking away of the circumstances, doth not take away the substance or being of it.

Wherefore it appeareth, that the command for *sealing* of Infants is not yet *abrogated*, but remaineth still; and seeing *Baptisme* was instituted by *Christ*, in stead of *circumcision*, the infants are to be baptized.

* Lin. 28.

But yet you question *, *Where the institution for baptizing of infants is?* And my answer is, That the *Institution* for *sealing* of the infants of the faithfull, was given to *Abraham*, and *Baptisme* being in stead of *Circumcision*, and more generall, and it being now the *seale*, they are to be baptized, as formerly they were to be circumcised.

* Lin. 30.

But you say *, *That was to circumcise, not to baptize, that all his males, not his females, that all borne in his house, or bought with money, at eight dayes old.*

Ans. All this maketh nothing against the baptizing of Infants; for the *signe* and *seale* of the *righteousnesse* of faith, is not *ceased*, but the substance thereof continueth, though the outward shadow or element is departed, and delivered unto us (as it were) in another garb.

And you granted before, that the females were implied in the males.

And you ought to know, that the generalitie of the latter Commission above the former, doth plead a specialitie which the Infants have in the latter, as well as in the former.

* Lin. 32.

But you say *, *If they ground it from this institution, then must they observe it in every thing, for so did Abraham, who had sinned in doing otherwise in any thing.*

To this I answer, That we may well ground this, from the institution of that, though we are not tyed to observe that in every thing. The institution for *sealing* the infants of the faithfull, ought to be observed by us, in every thing, and though God have altered the *circumstances*, as he hath done in divers other ordinances, (the substance of which wee have now in the ordinances of the Gospel) yet wee must not therefore neglect the substances of them, considering that they are not taken away by the alterations, changing, or taking away of the circumstances.

The *Passcover*, & the *Lords Supper*, were all one in substance, though they differed in circumstances; the *Baptisme* of *John*, and the *Baptisme* of *Christ*, were one, though they differed in some circumstances. And the like may be instanced in divers other ordinances, which are equivalent and suitable each to other; And therefore it will hold in *Circumcision* and *Baptisme*. And so this still pleadeth the *divine right* which Infants have to the *seale* now, as they had to the *seale* then*.

Now, that which is not onely permitted (or allowed) but commanded, it is both right and equall it should be observed, *Dent. 12. 32.*

* See this treated
rise, pag. 121.
at lin. 7.

But God commanded the outward seale of his Covenant of grace to be imposed upon the infants of his people, Gen. 17. 11, 12, 13. Rom. 4. 11. This commandement in respect of the substance of it, was never yet abrogated or disannulled.

Therefore it is in the substance of it, still to be continued, and it is both right and equall it should be observed.

Next you say ?

Here they say *, Wee have another institution to baptize all Nations, Mat. 28. 19.

A. R.
* Lin. 35.

But heere you should observe, that wee stand not for the baptizing of all Nations, but as they appeare unto us by the rule of the Word to be Disciples. Secondly, Though this be generall, in respect of the subjects, yet it is a particular institution to baptize, as Abrahams was to circumcise.

And now let us heare your answer.

Then they ought to observe that institution, which is first to make Disciples, and then to baptize them so made : for so is the institution, and no otherwise *.

A. R.

* Lin. 37.

To which I reply; That we do observe that institution, We plead not for the Baptizing of those who are not Disciples, no more then that any were formerly to be circumcised, who were not Disciples ; for the institution of circumcision, and of Baptisme, is one and the same, though the circumstances in the severall acts are different, as I shewed before ; and infants are as capable to be Disciples now, as they were formerly, and you cannot justly deny, that the infants of beleevers are Disciples.

Now though none were to take a ground for Circumcision from the institution of Baptisme, yet from Circumcision they might take a ground for Baptisme ; not to enlarge the institution of Christ for Baptisme, as if it were lesse generall then the institution of Circumcision, but to shew the largenesse of Circumcision, that thereby wee may confute those that doe seeke to make Baptisme (in reference to the subjects) more straiter (or lesse generall) then circumcision ; for circumcision was acted upon the male infants, in which (you confessed) the female infants were included. And I know not how any can without sacriledge, rob (or deprive) both the infants of the male, & female kinde, of these holy things, which

If Christs Commission for Baptisme, doth not concerne infants at all, but aged persons, as some men dreame, then his dayes are dayes of famine, & not of food, times of poverty, not of plenty, of leannes, not of fatnes. Now wee ought to note, that the glory of the first Commission, is included in the second ; if then the second be lesse generall then the first, & have swallowed up the former, and yet not increased, but diminished, then it is like Pharoahs 7 leane eares of corne, and 7 leane kine, which swallowed up the fat ones. But Christs Commission is much larger then that given to Abraham, and therefore the dreame, that infants are not in the latter as well as in the former, is false.

are so largely distributed since *Christs* manifestation in the flesh; for considering that *infants* were once to be commanded to be sealed in their *infancie*, and are not forbidden in the Scripture, they ought to be sealed: But it was once commanded, that the *infants* of *believers* should be sealed in their *infancie*, and is no where forbidden in the Scripture; therefore the *seale* of the *Covenant* ought to be imposed upon them in their *infancie*.

* See A. R.
pag. 5, lin. 24.

* Pag. 21.

* Lin. 7.

* Pag. 20 l. 40.

Lin. 13.

And seeing you have acknowledged, that the *females* were included in *Circumcision*, or in the *circumcised males*; therefore your objection against the position*, (by way of answer) that *Abraham* was not forbidden to *circumcise his females*, is to no purpose, unlesse it be to contradict your selfe; for seeing you have granted the *females* to be included, they were not excluded; therefore your comparison heer of the *males* of *Abrahams beasts*, as his *camels* and *asses** with *Abrahams infants*, either *male*, or *female*, is not equall; no more then that of the *Bartholomew-babies*, which you formerly shewed (in pag. 16.) But still it appeareth, that our position*, being builded upon a right foundation, remaineth permanent, for it cannot be shewed, either by expresse command, or necessary consequence, that *God* hath forbidden the baptizing of *holy Infants*.

Moreover, Whereas you labour to seeke out what they mean, that affirme, *Infants now are as capable of Baptisme*, with all its significations, as *infants then were of Circumcision*.

Ans. I thinke they intend that the *infants* have not only a *capableness*, but also a *right* to receive the ordinance of *Baptisme*, as the *infants* of *believers* had not only a *capableness*, but also a *right* to the ordinance of *Circumcision*. And I suppose, if you seek to prove that the *infants* of *believers* were more capable of *Circumcision*, and had more right unto it, then the *infants* of *believers* are now capable of *Baptisme*, or have right unto it now, you will loose all your labour.

* Pag. 2 l. lin.

19.

But you (in your answer*) doe affirme, that so all *infants* in the world are capable of *Baptisme*; and so all *infants* from *Adam* to *Abraham* were capable of *Circumcision*. And next, you demand of them why these were not *circumcised*? You say, *They will say, because Circumcision was not then commanded; but as soone as it was commanded, it was done.*

Lin. 20.

But I tell you for answer, That to affirme, that as soone as *Circumcision* was commanded to be done upon some *infants*, it was done (or to be done) upon all *infants*. It is an untruth, as this demand* is your

your owne, so I doubt not but the *answer* * thereunto is yours also; for your tenets leadeth you to this, that *Abraham* might *circumcise* any *Apostate* he would, so that he brought them in his *house*, though they neither feared *God*, nor revered *man*. I will not say, this is *childish*, but I am sure it is *foolish*, and *brutish*, to have such unreverend thoughts, of the ordinance of *Circumcision*. But I suppose, that *Abraham* could better understand the minde of *God*, then those who labour so to debase the ordinance of *Circumcision*, and the right subjects thereof. As all those doe who affirme, that all the infants in the world, from *Adam* to *Abraham*, might have been circumcised, if *God* had instituted *Circumcision* then. But this is to bring in the seed of *Caine* with the seed of *Seth*, the infants of the idolatrous *Heathens*, with the infants of *Abraham*; and so to make a compounded mixture in the *Lords Church*, which he alwayes laboured to keep from pollution, by sequestering them from the vile.

* Lin. 27. compared with
lin. 19, 20.

Furthermore, You make answer to a position*, which is, that *God* gave to infants *Circumcision*, which was a signe and seale of the righteousness of faith and regeneration, *Gen. 17. 11. Rom. 4. 11.* And we know *God* giveth no lying signe, nor sealeth a Covenant to any persons that are not therein: Therefore infants are in the Covenant, have faith and regeneration, and so ought to be baptized now, as well as circumcised then.

* Lin. 26

To this your answer is *, That it is true, that *God* giveth no lying signe, nor sealeth to any persons that they are in the Covenant, when they are not therein.

* Lin. 32

To which I reply, That I like it well, that you will now confesse this truth.

But it appeareth by your following words *, that you take for granted, a thing which you have not proved, as if *God* declared and made knowne unto *Abraham*, that *Ishmael* was not in the Covenant before he was circumcised. And you cite *Gen. 17. 18, 19, 20, 21.* Which Scripture maketh nothing for your purpose; for if you will say, *God* established his Covenant onely with *Isaac*, and none other, and all the rest were out of the Covenant, then it will follow, that the rest of *Abrahams* children, which *Abraham* had by *Keturah*, yea, and the *Profelytes*, and their children, were out of the Covenant, by your ground. But you should consider, that *God* in establishing his Covenant with *Isaac*, and setting him out for a singular person, did give *Isaac* the preheminence; as *Sem* had above *Japhet* *, and *Judah* (*Jacobs* fourth

* Lin. 12, 13, 14

* Gen. 9. 27.

^a Gen. 49. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. fourth sonne) over his eleven brethren*; And God establishing the Covenant with Isaac as the root, did establish it unto all those who were of the true Religion, as the branches; but if any departed from Isaacs banner, they deprived themselves of Isaacs blessing.

Now for as much as it was the minde of God, that Ishmael should be circumcised*, and that circumcision was the signe, and seale of the righteousness of faith; It confirmeth it, that in the account of man, he was then to be judged worthy of it, even righteous, and in Gods covenant; for God is not (by your owne confession) the author of a lying signe, nor sealeth to any persons, that they are not in the Covenant, when they are not therein. Now this is in respect of visibilitie*; for Simon Magnus had Baptisme (the outward visible seale of the Covenant) and yet we cannot say, that he was ever in Gods secret account in the Covenant: for secret things belong to God.

^a Master Spilsbery granteth, that Ishmael and Esau were by God commanded to be circumcised as well as any of the rest of Abrahams seed, Gen. 17. 10. 13. See his Treat. of Bap. pag. 7. lin. 3. 4, 5.

So Iscariot and Magus were commanded to be baptized as well as Peter and Paul.

^a And so Mr. Spilsbery further granteth, That though such were rejected as were not elected, this made not the promise of God of none effect to those who stood firme in the Covenant by grace in Christ Jesus, as branches in the vine, pag. 17. lin. 21, 22.

And till God declared unto Abraham, that Ishmael was not in the Covenant, though he promised to give Isaac never so many priviledges, yet Abraham was not to judge Ishmael to be out of the Covenant, (any more then other of his household) till God had directed him so to judge.

Again, I suppose that Ishmael [being come to years of discretion] it was sacriledge in him to usurp the ordinance, and a sinne in Abraham to impose the same upon him, except he were in the Covenant (so farre as men were to judge) of which Covenant, this (by your own confession) was no lying signe.

Now though Infants were not capable to resist, or refuse to be circumcised, yet those of elder yeares could, and Ishmael was thirtie yeares of age when he was circumcised. Therefore Ishmael (submitting according as he and the rest of Abrahams familie were taught, (who were at yeares of discretion) was to be esteemed to be in the Covenant.

Moreover, That the children who were circumcised (according to Gods appointment) were visibly in the Covenant before they were circumcised, is apparent by Gen. 17. ver. 14. God sayth, The uncircumcised man child, whose flesh of his fore-skin is not circumcised, his soule shall be cut off from his people, he hath broken my Covenant. Which doth plainly argue that he was in the Covenant before, else how could he breake that which he never had? And Abrahams children

then could not be sayd to be rent out of the Covenant, w^{ch} they were never in, or rent frō a people, who were never theirs; but we may rather conclude, that as Gods covenant was their covenant, & Gods people their people, so God was their God, as he had testified himselfe to be*, before they were circumcised; & circumcision was added as a signe, for sealing or confirming of the same thing signified thereby. But whereas God himselfe calleth circumcision his Covenant*, meaning expressely a signe of it*; and Paul calleth it a seale of the righteousness of faith*; you say, It was not by God ordained, nor by Abraham understood to be to the persons circumcised, a seale of their being in Covenant, and much lesse of their being in the faith, or regenerated*; & so by this it seemeth, that you would make the words of Paul, and of God himselfe to be false; for you openly contradi& them both; as also that which you granted before, (namely,) that God giveth no lying signe, nor sealeth to any persons, that they are in the Covenant, when they are not therein.

Next you say, that Gen. 17. 11. and Rom. 4. 11. must be understood*, that the circumcision which Abraham received, both upon himselfe and seed, was to him and them a signe, and seale, that righteousness should be, (not by the law or circumcision in the flesh) but by the faith which Abraham had when he was yet uncircumcised: That he should be the father of all those of many Nations, which should afterwards beleve: and that as faith was imputed unto him for righteousness, even so likewise it should be imputed to all belevers whatsoever, whether they were circumcised or not. And that all these are, and were to be the onely heires and true seed, to whom the everlasting covenant and promises of life are assuredly made, and doe properly and undoubtedly appertaine, ver. 3. 11. 12. 13. 14. 16. 17. 18. 22. 23. 24. And therefore (you say) Circumcision never was, nor is any rule for baptizing.

Ans. That the Circumcision which Abraham received, was received by him, is true, but that the circumcision of his seed, was received by him, wanteth explanation; it would stand more with reason to say, that Abraham administered it upon his seed, and that his seed received it; then to say, that Abraham received the circumcision of his seed, [upon himselfe.] Abrahams received his owne circumcision upon himselfe, and his seed received their circumcision upon themselves, and so it was to each of them a signe, and seale, not that it was divers sorts of circumcisions, (because it was administered upon divers parties,) but the

And also I will be their God. That is (sayth Mr. Spilbery) their God, whom they shall beleve and obey, upon whom they shall depend for the performance of all that I have promised unto them, by which faith and obedience they shall acknowledge me to be their God. See Spils. Treat. Bap. pag. 12.

* Gen. 17. 10. & Ver. 11.

* Rom. 4. 11.

* See A. R. Pag. 21. 1. 37, 38, 39.

- See A. R.

* Pag. 21.

the same ordinance of circumcision which Abraham received upon himselfe, in particular, the same ordinance of circumcision his infants received upon themselves, in particular also.

And if you did but well consider the Texts, Gen. 17. 11. & Rom. 4. 11. you might see, that it was a signe and scale of the righteousness of faith, which went before circumcision.

Consider moreover, what benefit the infants of beleivers [which died in their infancie] had by it; for if you will say, that it was a signe and scale of that righteousness which they never were partakers of, (or for ought we know shall never be) then your owne confession will come against you*, where you grant, that God giveth no lying signe, &c. Now circumcision was a true signe of that righteousness which they had received formerly, and for confirmation of the covenant [which had been] made to them before, and to be further and further manifested, and continued to them. This is cleare from Gen. 17. 11. 14. & Rom. 4. 11. as hath been shewed before.

And therefore you may see, that I plead not that that righteousness came by the Law, or Circumcision; for they were righteous before, otherwise they could not have been capable of the scale of righteousness.

The righteousness sealed, was a righteousness before the scale was fixed. And this righteousness was imputed unto them all, both young and old, great and small, infants and aged persons; It was unto them a signe and scale of righteousness, yea, unto the Infants as well as others.

And this righteousness which it sealed, was not the righteousness of the Law, but the righteousness of faith; and the righteousness of faith speaketh on this wise; Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend up into heaven, that is, to bring [Christ] downe from above? or Who shall descend into the deep, that is, to bring up [Christ] againe from the dead? But what saith it, the Word is nigh thee, &c.

Wherefore it appeareth, that you have not done well, in inferring from the premises, that circumcision is no rule for baptizing, you ought rather to have concluded, that it is a rule for baptizing, seeing that circumcision was a Gospel scale, & that the Baptisme which Christ hath instituted, is one and the same with it, a signe of the same thing, a scale of the same Covenant. And therefore though circumcision is not the [only] rule for baptizing, yet it is a rule, which the Saints of God may strengthen themselves withall, in the administration of Baptisme upon their infants.

Consider

Consider further; What *circumcision* sealed to the infants of beleevers, (that died in their *infancie*.) what good it did doe them; either it did them good, or hurt. It was a wound, or hurt [in respect of their bodies] but it did not hurt their soules; therefore it was [some] benefit to them; for if it should not, then God gave a thing to hurt their bodies, and to doe no good to their soules. The land of *Canaan* it sealed not unto them; for they never lived to enjoy it; A *fleshly fatherhood*, it sealed not unto them; for they died in *infancie*. What did it seale then? Did it seale nothing? Wee will not say so; they being the infants of those whose *sinnes* were forgiven; and they being such which could not act, and therefore not commit *actuell sinne*. Surely (when all commeth to all) wee must confesse, that this sealed unto them some *spirituall* thing; for (they having received the wound, and incision, and dying in their *infancie*) it appeareth, that it sealed not unto them a *naturall* life, therefore it sealed unto them a *spirituall* life, and a *spirituall* place, wherein they shall enjoy that *spirituall* life; which place, is the heavenly land of *Canaan*. God did not ayme at the hurt of the infants when he commanded them to be *circumcised*, but at their good. Wherefore this very hurt of their bodies, did demonstrate some good thing which weighed downe all their former hurt. And therefore seeing that infants received benefit *spiritually* by *circumcision*, that benefit came from God; God gave it to the fathers before *Moses* was borne almost *four hundred yeares*; And he never intended to take away this *beneficiall ordinance* from the infants, but to plant as great a one in stead thereof, and make it sure to them, yea, as sure as the promise. Otherwise *Christ* should be lesse faithfull in his house, then *Moses*; for *Moses* was so faithfull, that he durst not (nay, would not) presume to lay such *sacrilegious hands* upon *Circumcision*, (Gods holy institution) as to bereave infants of *circumcision*, and disanull it by his old law, which came long after it; yea, the *Apostle* expressly declareth, that the Law could not disanull the covenant, and wee know it did not disanull the signe and seale of that covenant; neither did *Christ* ever disanull it, or bereave holy infants of the benefit of it; but did take off the old garment, and put on a new. I mean, changed onely the *circumstantiall* part of the signe of his covenant, but the substance remained still, though under another element.

And as a man which hath one day, one manner of apparrell, another time, another suite of apparrell, of another colour, and more excellent then the former, is still the same man, though in another habite; So

the ordinances of Christ, which are equivolent one with the other, are the same, though the latter excell the former. So the seventh day was the same with the first day of the weeke, as it was a Sabbath, though not as it was [the seventh day,] yet as wee may take a ground for the keeping of [a] Sabbath, from the old Testament, leaving out the circumstance, not tying our selves to [the] seventh day; so wee may take a ground from circumcision, as it was [a] signe and seale of the righteousness of faith, whereby wee may be grounded in the administration of Baptisme: And it is seriously to be minded, that Baptisme is not larger then circumcision one way, and lesser another way (I mean lesse generall) but (in every respect) it is as generall, yea, and (in some respects) more generall: As generall, because such males who had right to circumcision, have right to Baptisme: More generall, because circumcision was to be administred onely upon the males; but Baptisme upon males and females. Now to make it more generall, and lesse generall, then circumcision, is a contradiction, and you by no meanes will allow of contradictions, at least you pretend it.

If a Master promise to give his servants such or such a portion in brasse, fannings, and above his usuall (or ordinary) custome, give it them in silver, weight, for weight; It is all one. He hath fulfilled his promise, seeing he lesseneth not the summe, and his servants (if they are wise, & know what is good for themselves) will not take exceptions therat, or refuse the same; Even so it is with God and his people, The things which he giveth unto them, are better and better, not worse and worse, larger and larger, not lesser and lesser; and therefore we may apply this to this particular case in hand, and believe with David, that God hath magnified his Word above all his Name.

Now though Baptisme be greater, and more generall then circumcision, in respect of the subjects, upon whom the same is administred; yet it doth not therefore argue, that Baptisme is the seale of one covenant, and circumcision the seale of another covenant: The River of the Sanctuary, mentioned in Ezekiel, though it was not so deep in one place, as in another place, yet it was the same River; And a small light and a greater light, is all one and the same light, though the greater seem (in a manner) to swallow up the lesser; So a fire, is still the same fire, though it be increased as much again as it was, fastening upon more fuel, yet it is still one and the same, though much greater then before: So Baptisme, although it be, to be imposed upon the females, and differeth in respect of the act from circumcision, yet it is one and the same in effect, a seale of one and the same covenant; for the enlargement of a thing (as I said before) changeth not the nature of the thing enlarged, but maketh it to include more then it did before.

Whereas it is said, that Infants were then members of the Church; and whereas it is demanded, When they were cast out? To this you answer;

a Pag 22 l. 15.
b Lin 22.
c Lin 13.

That

That they were cast out when the Jewes Church-state, and old covenant was abrogated by the comming of Christ, and preaching of the Gospel, and planting other Churches, farre different from that of the Jewes in many respects. Line 15.

To this I reply ; That this which you have said , proveth not at all, that infants were cast out; There is not one tittle of Scripture in all the New or Old Testament to this purpose, that the infants of beleevers are, (or shall be) cast out; Bring me one Instance, if you can, of any one infant of a beleever, that at Christs coming was to be cast out, & then you will say something for their exempting out of the covenant, but as yet you have brought none, neither can you finde any, but many, yea, multitudes of Scripture there are to the contrary, both in the new and old Testament.

But you seem to poynt out the time when the holy infants were cast out of the Church; You tell us, they were cast out when the Jewes Church-state, and old covenant was abrogated by the coming of Christ, and preaching of the Gospel, and planting other Churches, farre different from that of the Jewes in many respects. But alas, you take for granted, a thing which you have not proved, and it is no marvaile indeed, to see the thing that is not probable, to be without prooffe. That the Jewes Church-state was abrogated with the old covenant, I am not bound to beleeve, except I see it in Gods Word, much lesse will I grant, that the preaching of the Gospel overthrew the Church-state. But seeing the new Jerusalem hath gates and foundations, according to the number of the twelve Tribes, and twelve Apostles of the Lambe, and that the Jewes and Gentiles being grafted into one Olive tree, make up but one Church. I must conclude, that the Church of the Jewes is the Church of the Gentiles; for Christ is not properly the head of two bodies; neither did he come to abrogate the old Church*, though he abrogated the old covenant.

But now let us see how farre you would make this Church different, from the Church of Israel; you know, it must be either in matter, or in forme, or in both, otherwise, (I suppose) (you will strive without an opposite,) for all Christians generally doe confesse, that they were bound to observe such circumstances, which wee are not bound to observe; but all this did not argue, but that their Church was fit matter, and a right forme, and the same with the Church of the Gentiles.

Rev. 21.

Rom. 11.

*So Mr. Spilsbery sayth, That the Church of God under the old Testament, and that now under the new, for nature are one, in reference to the elect of God, called to the faith, and by the spirit of grace united to Christ, as branches to their vine, and so an holy plant of Gods planting; of which indeed the true Church of God consisteth. See his Treatise of Baptisme, 1. at lib. 14.

* At lin. 20.

But you say*, That was constituted upon nature, and the naturall seed of Abraham; this upon grace, and the spirituall seed of Abraham.

To w^{ch} I answer, That if by nature, you mean corruption, as it appeareth you do, then (by your ground) the Church of the Jewes was constituted upon corruption, & was a corrupt Church, a leperous Church, in the very constitution. You think, that the Church of the Jewes in her constitution, (w^{ch} was of Gods building, Isa. 5. 1, 2, 3. & consisted

* No man (sayth Mr. Spilsbery will admit of dead plants to be set in his vineyard, or grafted into a stock, but onely such as are capable to comply with the same, in the sap, and nourishment thereof, to the end it may grow, and bring forth fruit: and so it is with Christ, who comes not short of nature, and therefore he admits not of any dead plants to be set in his spirituall vineyard, or dead members to be joyned to his mysticall body, but onely such as by faith are capable to comply with the head. Neither tooke he for himselfe a compounded body, consisting of both living & dead members, which all are that have not a living principle of grace, &c. For this see his Treat. of Bap. pag. 20. lin. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.

and

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

see

* See before in this Treatise pag. 29, 30, 31. For there it is answered at large.

tution, (w^{ch} was of Gods building, Isa. 5. 1, 2, 3. & consisted all of visible Saints, Deut. 29. 18.) to be corrupt. For the like you said before in your book, p. 4. That they stood meerly upon nature and circumcision of the flesh & not by faith, and circumcision of the heart. And here you oppose this nature unto grace, & the naturall seed unto the spirituall seed. And thus it appeareth, that you hold neither the matter, nor forme of the Church to be spirituall then, nor the persons gracious, but ungracious, fleshly, and carnal. But the Scripture teacheth us, that they were a holy nation, and a peculiar people unto the Lord their God; and so excellent, that none were like unto them; Great advantage had they every manner of way: Unto them was committed the Oracles of God. And shall wee thinke, that God committed his Oracles to a Church which had a carnall constitution? or that he owned such for his holy peculiar people? God made an everlasting covenant with Abraham, that he would be a God unto him and his seed for ever. And though the Law was added, because of transgression, yet it could not disanull the covenant, and therefore not the Church (or people of the covenant), or the seale of the promise. Now surely, if that the Church had been constituted upon nature corrupted, (such as you have opposed to grace) and upon the naturall, & not upon the spirituall seed, then there was no difference between the Israelites, and the Heathens; and then was the Church of Israel, no communion of Saints, but a mixt multitude, which I thinke is very erroneous, as may appeare by these Scriptures, Exod. 19. 5, 6. & 22. 31. & 12. 48, 49. Num. 9. 14 & 15. 15. Levit. 19. 2. & 20. 7, 8. Deut. 7. 6. & 14. 1, 2. & 26. 18, 19. 1 King. 8. 53. Deut. 4. 20. & 29. 10, 11, 12, 13. & 10. 13. Psal. 147. 14.

But from this your groundlesse affirmation, you would (through an inference) make another disparitie, between the Church of the Jewes, and the Church of the Gentiles: You say, That was therefore termed Israel according to the flesh, and of the circumcision of the flesh.

this Israel according to the Spirit, and of the circumcision of the heart, Rom. 8. 28, 29. Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8. Coll. 2. 11. And to this I answer, That your speech doth here import, as if none who were Israel according to the flesh, were Israelites according to the spirit: but the Apostle sayth, All are not Israel that are of Israel; He maketh a manifest difference between Israel, the Church of God, and those who were not really Israelites, though they came of Israels loynes according to the flesh. But your speech crosseth the Apostles speech, and tendeth to prove, that all were Israel that were of Israel. But what will you say to the Proselytes, and their seed? Were they Israel according to the flesh? Surely they were not; therefore they were Israelites according to the spirit? As well as others, who were also Israelites, both according to the spirit, and flesh.

Moreover, None were to be circumcised, externally in the flesh, but those who were in Gods covenant, and were circumcised in heart, so farre as men could discern; and those that were in Gods covenant, were Israelites spiritually, and so to be esteemed, even as true members of the Church. So David sayth, Yet surely God is good unto Israel, unto those that are pure in heart. Circumcision of the flesh sealed unto them the circumcision of the heart; and this God promised both to them, and their seed, and then both male, and female, were all one in Christ*, and so they are now**.

As for the Scriptures (Rom. 2. 28, 29. Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8. Coll. 2. 11) w^h you cite, they make nothing for your present purpose; to prove, That that was [onely] called Israel according to the flesh, and the other onely according to the spirit; The one constituted upon that [nature] (which you have opposed to grace) & upon the naturall seed (destitute of the spirit,) the other constituted on grace (without nature,) and the spirituall seed of Abraham (without the naturall seed) Prove this, and then you say something, else it is nothing to your purpose.

But indeed the substance of what you say heer, is answered at large in this Treatise, pag. 29, 30, 31, 32, 33.

And now I will proceed to examine the Scriptures which you have cited heer, for confirmation of these your opinions.

As touching Rom. 2. 28, 29. there the Apostle declareth who are the true Jewes indeed, (namely) those that are Jewes inwardly; and that the true Circumcision indeed, is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter, whose praise is of God, &c. Now will you reason from this place, that those who were the naturall seed (not degenerating) were not

Dent. 30. 6.

* Exod. 12. 48,

49.

Num. 9. 14.

& 15. 14, 15,

16.

** Gal. 3. 28.

not the spirituall seed? and that because God accepted of the infants with their parents, and commanded them to be circumcised, that therefore the Church-state was built upon nature, and not upon Christ. Surely you cannot gather any such thing from the Apostles words, in Rom. 2. 28, 29. nor from any other place of Scripture, but rather the contrary. Yea, the Apostle in the following Chapter declareth, that as for the advantage of the Jew, and the profit of circumcision, it was much every manner of way; chiefly because that unto them were committed the Oracles of God: For (sayth he) what if some did not beleve, shall their unbeliefe make the faith of God without effect? God forbid: And so he concludeth, that both Jewes and Gentiles are justified by faith; Seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith; Doe wee then make voyd the Law through faith? (sayth he) God forbid: yea, wee establish the Law.

*Psal. 32. 1, 2.

And in the fourth Chapter Paul treateth of justification by faith without workes; and expoundeth Davids speech; for whereas David sayth*, Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not sinne, and in whose spirit there is no guile. Paul explaineth it thus; Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth [righteousnesse without workes:] From which places of Scripture, much may be gathered against those who denie infants to have faith imputatively; for the Apostle declareth that he to whom the Lord imputeth not sinne, is a righteous person.

Now every person is either righteous, or unrighteous; for as righteousness is not imputed unto those to whom sinne is imputed, So those whose iniquities are pardoned, and their sinne covered, the Lord (imputing no sinne unto them) he imputeth righteousness unto them, [without workes,] and this righteousness, is that which justifieth before God. It was faith which was counted unto Abraham for righteousness. And so he proceedeth in the 2th, 10th, and 11th verses, to prove, that this blessing, or blessednesse, came not onely upon the circumcision, but also upon the uncircumcision, declaring that Abraham received not circumcision before hee had this blessednesse; wherefore he calleth Circumcision a signe, and scale of the righteousness of faith, which he had before he was circumcised; which importeth, that all those who were circumcised then (according to Gods appointment) were (in visibilitie) blessed before, and had this righteousness before; even as all those who are baptized, according to Gods appointment, are righteous before, and have (in visible account) the same blessing, w^{ch} those had, who were circumcised, according to the revealed

revealed will of God. And he goeth on in the 13, 14, 15. verses, and there telleth us, who are the right heires. And in the 16th verse, he sayth, that the promise is sure to all the seed, not to that onely which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all. And he further sheweth, that this promise ([so shall thy seed be,] and that Abrahams beleeving Gods promise,) was imputed unto him for righteousness; and was not written for his sake alone, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if wee beleeve on God.

Touching the other Scripture, Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8. which you alledge to prove your former position, concerning the different constitutions of the Church of the Jewes, and of the Church of the Gentiles, it maketh nothing for your purpose neither, but directly against you; for there wee may see, that though all are not Israel which are of Israel, yet the Word of God taketh effect; according to that in Rom. 3. 3.

Ishmaels mocking of Isaac, did not argue, that Isaac was also a mocker.

Isaac remained still a childe of promise, (though an Infant,) But if it be true, (as you would infer) that the state was a state of bondmen, and that an heire, or Lord, differed nothing from a servant of sinne, and if it were constituted, and stood meerly upon nature, and circumcision of the flesh; and not by faith, and circumcision of the heart: it argueth that the Word of God is without effect! that all were Israel that were of Israel! all mockers with Ishmael! prophane persons with Esau! &c. which to thinke, is very erroneous; for the word of God hath taken effect, to retaine the holy Infants, and cast out visible prophane persons, and therefore the state wherein they were, was a state of free-men.

God was well pleased with them, and accepted of their sacrifices, and promised unto them, remission of their sinnes through Jesus Christ, who was then to come, and is now come. Therefore I would have you to banish such evill thoughts out of your minde, as if they had a false, corrupt, or carnall, and not a spirituall constitution.

Againe consider, That Church upon whom holy Baptisme was rightly administred, was holy and spirituall.

But holy Baptisme was rightly administred upon the Church of Israel.

Therefore they were a holy spirituall Church, as well as wee.

But peradventure you will say, you mean, that in their Apostasie they

Isaac was no mocker, though he were mocked, no persecuter, though persecuted in his infancy.

1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.
Psa. 77. 16, 17,

they pleased not God; and therefore their Church-state which they were in formerly, had a carnall constitution, and was not spiritnall.

To which I answer, That the like you may say concerning the Churches now, which you acknowledge to be spiritnall. But you should consider, that many are talled, but few are chosen: Gods garden may have some plants therein, which possibly may degenerate from their kinde, and become wilde, yet the garden is still the Lords; but the husband-men ought when they discover such, to weed them out. So corruptions began to spring in the Church of Corinth, and they cut downe the tender fruits thereof in time. And God threatned the members of some of the Churches of Asia, to execute judgement upon them, if repentance prevented him not.

As for Coll. 2. 11. which you have cited, that the Church of Collossia, was circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the finnes of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ. This implyeth not but that the Jewes and Profelytes. before Christs coming, had circumcision of the flesh, as an outward signe unto them, that the Lord would circumcise their hearts, and the hearts of their seed, to love him more and more, according to his gracious promise. And seeing that the Apostle maketh circumcision heer, the same in effect with our Baptisme, it plainly argueth, that as infants (in former time) were to receive circumcision, so infants now (in their infancie) are to receive Baptisme, the scale of the same covenant.

Whereas you say, That was a state of bond men*, wherein an heire differed nothing from a servant, this, not of servants*, but of sonnes and free-men. I suppose you mean by bond-men, those who were bound-servants to Sathan; and by free-men; those who were set free by Christ. In this respect then you have not done well, in saying that such a one that was made free (in this spiritnall respect) differed nothing from those who were visibly bond-slaves of Sathan. Then (it seemes) Isaac differed nothing from a mocker; nor the Profelytes infants, from Heathens and Infidels.

And if you mean, by servants, those who are wicked in the Church, I say, they were to be cast out, as they manifested evil fruits; for though they were in the house a while, and were as children, yet they manifesting themselves afterwards to be servants of sinne, were no longer to abide; but those who are not servants of sinne, are now (as they were then) to abide for ever therein; so Ishmael was in covenant with Isaac, and was circumcised; but when he manifested fruits

Col. 2. 11.

Rev. 2. & 3.

* Lin. 23.

* Lin. 28.

of unholinesse, out he was cast. And why was this? Not because he was *Abrahams sonne*, according to the *flesh*; but because he manifested himselfe afterward to be a *servant of sinne*, and so degenerated from the righteous steps of *Abraham*. Gen. ii. 9, 10.

Now you ought to know, that the Church of the *Jewes* was constituted of *free-men*, and there was not one *sinner* to be suffered in that church, but when he was discovered, either he must *repent*, or be *cut off*; therefore it plainly argueth, that visible wicked persons, *bond-slaves* of *Sathan*, were not to be the matter of that Church; in the first constitution, they were such who in all outward appearance, were not *alliens* from *Gods covenants*, or *promises*, or *strangers* to *God*, but were such whom he knew, and owned, and such whom he would acknowledge, as in the *kingdome of grace* heer, so in the *kingdome of glory* hereafter. See before in this Treatise pag. 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 147, 148, 149.

It may be you thinke thus; That if the Church of *Israel* were constituted of *free-men*, why then were many of them manifested afterwards to be wicked? *Corah*, and his company, a congregation of *Rebels*, from whom *Moses*, and the rest were commanded to separate; famous men, and men of renoune amongst the *Israelites*, and yet were chiefe in the rebellion; also *Nadab* and *Abihu*, offerers of *strange fire*, and many more, manifested themselves to be *evill persons*.

Ans. If this be any ground of your prejudicacie against the Church of the *Jewes*, then let this satisfie you, that these were *free-men* at first, according to *visibilitie*, as holy as *Judas*, or *Simon Magnus*, or *Ananias* and *Saphira*; And therefore if it be an argument of a false constitution, for members of a Church of *God* to fall from their *stedfastnesse*, then it will follow, that the Church now (under the *Gospel*) hath not a true constitution, seeing that divers fall from their *stedfastnesse*, some for a time, like the *incestuous person* in the Church of *Corinth*, others, finally, totally, and eternally, like *Judas Iscariot*, who was one of the *Twelve Apostles*.

Let this then be the conclusion, that the *State* may be a *State of free-men*, though some *bond-men* appeare in it, and are cast out, as *Ishmael* the sonne of the *bond-woman*, was cast out of the *State of free-men*, wherein the *infants of beleevers* were admitted, though they were not the seed of *Abraham* according to the *flesh*.

And the consideration of this maketh much for the *infants of beleevers* now, for as much as *beleevers* (even *free-men*) *priviledges* are much enlarged since *Christs* manifestation in the *flesh*. The *free-men*

had this *priviledge* formerly to bring in their *infants*, and to difference them from those without: And surely their *priviledges* are not lessened

*What had the *Infants* of beleeving parents done, to deserve *Excommunication* (or casting out of the Church?) If they had don nothing worthy of it (as it is sure they had not) then I may justly conclude, that they were not children of the bond woman, and if not of the bond-woman, then still of the free-woman, and if children of the free-woman, then members of the Church, and if so, then there is no iust reason can be given to debarre such holy *Infants* of their *priviledges*; amongst which, *Baptisme* is one, as *Circumcision* was of old.

* Lin. 30.

now: * *Christ* came not to bring *losse* and *damnage* to holy *infants*; And if it be true, w^{ch} you say, That till *Christ* coming, an *heire* (or beleever) differed nothing from a servant. If by a servant, you mean *Ismael*, or such as he, who manifested themselves to be servants of sinne, then why was the son of the bond woman cast out, & differenced from the sonne of the free-woman? But indeed you should minde, that *Christ* came to take the yoke of the Law from the shoulders of beleevers, and so to ease them of that servitude, under which they were; and this doth not impair the *infants* of beleevers, no not in the least.

Touching *Christ*s discourse*, which you bring to make your affirmations to appeare evident true; It doth evidence, that your affirmations in this particular, are evident false; for *Christ* sayth no such thing which you faine, that he saith; for he speaketh to those that did derogate from the steps of *Abraham*, which the beleevers

Infants could not justly be said to doe. And *Christ* doth not say, that the Church of the *Jewes* was constituted upon nature, flesh, carnall, opposite to the spirit; but he sayth, that those that continued in his Word, they then were his *Disciples* indeed, & should know the truth, and the truth should make them free; (not that the Church, where he and his brethren were members, was evilly constituted, because evil persons were in it, or degenerated from it) but that these were members in the Church, which had need to amend, or else to be cast out.

See *John* 8.

Their answer to *Christ* was, that they were *Abraham*s seed, and so were free alreadie, and were never in bondage to any man. But in this they said not true; for they had degenerated from the steps of *Abraham*. And *Christ* in telling them, that whosoever committeth sinne, is the servant of sinne; did therein declare, that it was no benefit unto any to be of *Abraham*s seed, if they degenerated from *Abraham*s steps; for this was a means, (though they were members of the true Church) to make them no members of it, but to be cast out thence; for (so sayth *Christ* unto them) the servant abideth not in the house for ever. Now by this house, is meant his Church, in which though sinners abide covertly (for a time) yet as they manifest themselves to be

rupt, and *leuenous*, are (or at least ought) to be cast out ; Therefore they abide not there for ever ; So the *Jewes* were taught by the ceremony of casting away *leaven*, to cast out the *leaven* of *sinne*, out of their hearts, and out of their families ; and also to purge the Church of God, both of *sinne*, and *sinners*, so far as they could discern by the light of Gods Word, But those that were true *Saints*, were to abide in that true Church-state for ever. So it is said, *Psal. 15. 5.* That such shall never be moved out of Gods Tabernacle, and holy Mountaine. So Christ sayth heer, that the Sonne abideth for ever ; If therefore the Sonne make you free, you shall be free indeed. By this freedome, he meant a freedome from condemnation for ever, from the law of *sinne*, and of death for ever, because he opposeth it to the bondage they were in.

Further, These persons whom Christ reprehended, were not obedient to the new covenant, neither did they regard the commandements of the Law ; for the commandement sayth, *Thou shalt not kill.* But Christ sayd unto them ; I know you are *Abrahams seed*, but yee seek to kill me, because my Word hath no place in you, &c. This wickednesse of theirs, was not warranted, neither by the new, nor old covenant, and therefore they were not allowed in any respect, but condemned. Wherefore it evidently appeareth, that you cannot gather from either of the covenants, that such visible wicked persons, were by God allowed to be in (much lesse the ground of) his Churches constitution after their discovery. These then were not meet to be members of the Church of the *Jewes*, yea, though they were the children of *Abraham* (according to the flesh) yet by the new and old covenant, were to be cast out, when the least infant of a faithfull *Proselyte*, remained still a member of the Common-wealth of *Israel*, which was the Church of God.

Moreover, Christ did not affirme any such thing (as you would further faine he did,) that persons by naturall birth, and circumcision of the flesh, were admitted free ; for *Ismaelites* and *Edomites*, by fleshly generation, were the children of *Abraham*, yet they were not therefore admitted free-men, till they renounced their parents sinne, and came into the Church. And the infants of wicked parents, were circumcised in *Apostacie* ; yet wee will not say, that therefore they were free ; But this wee are to know, that the naturall seed of the faithfull, that were not apostated, or degenerated, were to be accounted the true seed ; and all those who were circumcised, according to Gods appointment, were the true seed in covenant with God, and so were made free ; when *Apostates* (though circumcised) were bond-servants to sinne, and

Gen. 17. 14.

were not to be admitted (as they stood in that state of *Apostacie*) to be members of the Church of the *Jewes*, as you most fainedly would fasten upon *Christ*.

You saie as if *Christ* should say, that *Abrahams* nature could produce no other but servants of sinne, &c. But I know not what you mean hereby. I know *Abraham* was a sinner in the loynes of *Adam*, yet *Adams* sinne was not imputed unto him to condemnation; no more was it visibly to *Abrahams* seed, but as they degenerated from *Abrahams* steps; for the sinne of *Abraham*, which he had actually, and originally, was forgiven him in *Christ*.

And thinke not, that he was destitute of the new covenant, for though the new covenant was before the manifestation of the old covenant at *Mount Sinai*, yet it was new in respect of perpetuities, though old in respect of antiquities; & is set forth in *Rev. 4.* by the similitude of a *Rainbow*, in sight like an *Emerald* round about the throne of *God*.

And the Infants of *Abraham* were never out of the Church-state, though they apostated, & degenerated from the steps of *Abraham*; If the promise had been made to seeds, as of many, then there had been some ground to beleieve, that visible wicked persons, or persons meerly naturally destitute of the spirit, were fit matter for the constitution of that Church; and that the seed of Apostates might be circumcised, as well as others. But the promises were made onely to one seed*, namely, *Christ*, that is to say, *Christs* body, which consisteth (or ought to consist) of none but sonnes of *God*, by faith in *Christ*. And seeing the promise made to *Abraham*, and his seed, was not made through the Law (namely, the old Law) and that this old Law could not disannul the promise, therefore the old covenant could be removed, and yet the promise continue still, to all those subjects to whom it was made.

But further you would saie, that the flesh spoken of in *Gen. 17.* was *Christ*, who was to come of their flesh. But you should know that *Christ* came of the Tribe of *Judah*, by liniall descent, and not of the rest of the Tribes, nor of the father-Profelytes, and yet they were circumcised, that covenant of circumcision was in their flesh.

Moreover, *Christ* himselfe was circumcised [in his infancy] where was that covenant, if he were the flesh spoken of? The covenant was in his flesh, as well as in the flesh of his brethren. Now if the flesh we may, and ought to understand, that place from whence the superfluous of their foreskinne was cut off. My covenant, sayth *God*, shall be in [your] flesh; and the uncircumcised man-child, whose [flesh]

* Gal. 3. 16.

See A. R.

Page 14. li. 1, 2.

Mat. 1.

Luk. 3.

Isa. 11.

* Luk. 2. 21.

Gen. 17. 10.

Ver. 14.

his foreskin] is not cut off, the same person shall be cut off, &c.

Againe, If by the flesh, was onely meant Christs naturall body, and by the covenant, onely the circumcision, which Christ was to receive, (and did receive) in his flesh. Then circumcision was abolished, (or at an end) when Christ was circumcised, and none were to be circumcised after him.

Yea, and if he were that flesh, which was to be circumcised; then it will follow, that though none other had been circumcised before or after, they had not broken the covenant.

But God did declare, What the circumcision was, and where it was to be administred, and upon whom: First, It was a cutting off, of the superfluous fore-skinne: Secondly, That it was to be in their flesh, and not in the flesh of others in stead of them. Thirdly, That it was to be administred upon Jewes and Gentiles, that were in the covenant: And so such persons were by vertue of Gods covenant circumcised, not onely before Christ was circumcised, but also after; and therefore you have not done well to interpret Gen. 17. 13. after such a manner, & you have done evill, in faining it, as if it were the speech of Christ, when no such things ever entered into his thoughts.

Whereas you think circumcision was a covenant properly, you should know, that though circumcision had the denomination of Gods covenant^a, yet it was but a signe of it^b. The names of things signified (in the Scripture) are given to the signes, which signifie them; So the Lambe was called Gods Pascheover^c; the Rock, Christ^d; the bread and Wine in the Lords Supper, Christs body and blood, &c.^e And in this sense, is circumcision called Gods covenant, that is to say, a token, or signe thereof, as God termeth it himselfe in Gen. 17. ver. 11.

As for those which say, that the promise, covenant, election, and faith, belongeth to [all] beleevers children (w^{ch} supposed case you put to shut up all your matter) I tell you, that if by all, they mean the godly children of godly parents, then they say true; But that the wicked children of godly parents, have these excellent things belonging unto them, is no article of my faith. When the Apostle Peter sayth to the Jewes; The promise is unto (you, and to) [your children,] and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. In including the children heer with the parents, his meaning is not to include all beleevers children, but onely those holy ones who abide in their parents righteous steps; which thing holy Infants doe, as before hath been proved at large^a, they do not degenerate from the righteous steps of their holy parents.

Gen. 17.

Exod. 12. 48.

^a Gen. 14. 19.

^b Ver. 11.

^c Exod. 12. 11.

^d 1 Cor. 10. 4.

^e Mat. 26. 26.

^a See A. 2.

Pag. 25. at
lin. 8.

Act. 2. 39.

^a See pag. 3.

parents. And therefore such may be lawfully baptized, for no more in effect is required to Baptisme, then was to circumcision of old; this is, as that was, and these are, as those were: *Holy infants* were to be circumcised then, and therefore such may be lawfully baptized now.

* See A. R.
Pag. 25. li. 19.

Next, you * charge the great Clerkes of our times, with confounding the two Covenants, of the Law and Gospel together. And to this, I say, if by these great clerkes, you mean those who thinke *Infants Baptisme* to be a meer tradition; Indeed then your accusation may prove true upon them, for such as they doe put no difference between the new covenant, made with *Abraham* and his seed, and the old covenant and Law, which came long after it; but they thinke this new covenant, and the old covenant, to be both one, and doe not rightly understand the nature of them; and therefore the hodge-podge in their teachings, and writings, which you mention*, is their owne, as well as any other; as also the intermixture of grace and workes, truth and error; as also the distillation of the spirit of giddinesse into the hearts of their hearers, that they walke indeed (as you speak*) in a circular Maze. And so by confounding Law and Gospel, have laboured to bring you (or rather detain you) in bondage to sinne.

* Lin. 19.

* Lin. 33.

See A. R.
pag. 26. at
lin. 10.

Next, You would make us beleeve, that you desire that the doctrine of free grace by *Iesus Christ*, might be set forth distinctly in its native luster, and the spiritualitie thereof in its fulnesse of beautie and glory clearly layd open. Which is indeed a thing to be desired, both in the continuance and encrease thereof. But alas, little doe you thinke (as I in charitie judge) how all your labour in this Treatise, tendeth to the darkening, obscuring, eclipsing, restraining, and limiting of the doctrine of free grace by *Iesus Christ*, the distinct displaying of whose native luster, though it be never so often done, or the spiritualitie thereof in its fulnesse of beautie and glory, never so clearly layd open before you, yet you cannot see it clearly indeed, so long as you continue to hudwinke the eyes of your charitie, and present the blessed babes of beleeving parents, unto you, and your selfe unto them, in such beaushapes, as you have don throughout your discourse concerning them.

* See before in
this Treatise,
pag. 82.

You talk freely of free grace, as if it were excellent in your eyes, and that you desire to be satisfied with the fulnes of the beautie thereof. But in the mean while, you would not have us thinke that any part thereof belongeth to the *holy infants*: But surely (as I sayd before) it is well they are not at your finding; for if they were, it seemeth

that you would (*Dives-like*) not admit them the least crum which falleth from your *Table*. But our sweet Saviour *Jesus Christ*, who was once an *infant*, and is (and alwayes was) the onely begotten Sonne of God, full of grace and truth, hath free grace enough in store for them, and hath displayed the same excellently in its *native luster*, as is frequently manifested in the *Scripture of God*. Which thing no doubt you will perceive, when once God openeth your eyes to see how the covenant of *mercy* is made with *believing parents*, and their seed, that he will be their God, and will accept of them in *Christ*, (binding them to do nothing above their abilitie) And this free grace of God ariseth from his *loving kindnesse*, or good will which he hath unto them, and alwayes had; which kinde mind moved him to look upon them with the eye of pittie, and so to take such his chosen ones to himselfe. And this grace may well be said to be free, and why? Because it proceedeth not from workes, but from the love of God in *Christ Jesus*. The love which is in God, is that which moveth God, (who is love) to love; *Because He loved thy fathers, therefore He chose their seed*. So the covenant of free grace runs thus; *I will be the God*

Deut. 4. 37.
Gen. 17. 7, 8.

of thee, and of thy seed after thee: And he bindeth the *holy infants* to no action, or any thing which they cannot doe, but giveth them the true *blessement without works*; And therefore though you talke never so long of free grace, and tosse it never so often in your mouth, yet it is no freedome for you, but bondage unto you, so long as you doe (by with-standing *holy infants*) as it were, snatch their bread, out of their mouths. The ground whereof is your *unbelieve*, because you perswade your selfe, that the *holy infants* are not visibly in the state of *salvation*, till they *actually and verbally expresse faith*: As if the *believers infants* [dying in their *infancie*] were not saved by *Christ's righteousness*, imputed unto them without *workes*. And your own *errorrs* (you mention) which like *hypocrites twinnes*, doe smile and weep, stand and fall together, may be justly fathered upon those, who barre out the *infants* from the said *priviledges* which *Christ* hath bequeathed unto them, as they are selected unto him.

As for the gay *Clergie* which you mention, (meaning those of the Church of England, as I suppose) which you now run upon, (as you did at the latter end of your first book,) though it be to little purpose; (for as much as it doth not concerne our poynt in hand,) yet I will tell you what I know, and have found by experience, that they are faine to betake themselves to *Anubap-*

Pag. 25.

difficall Arguments, both for the *maintenance* of their *state*, and retaining of *evill persons* therein; which indeed ariseth from their grosse mistake of the *Historie* of the *Scripture*, thinking (as you doe) that the *Church* of the *Jewes* was constituted meeily upon *nature* and *cerualtie*, and the like stuffe, never considering that *God* (from the beginning of the *World*) alwayes constituted his *Church* onely of such persons, who in all *visible* account were *faithfull*, and *holy*; And still provided a way and means to *purge* the *Church* from *corruptions*.

Moreover, The parties (formerly specified) in maintenance of their *state*, have also a *fond* erroneous conceipt, that because they have some of *Gods ordinances*, therefore they are a true *Church*; not considering that *Gods ordinances* may be in a *false state*, as in *Jeroboams Whorish Church*, (as hath been observed formerly *.) Hereupon they are forceably driven, either to *confesse* the *Church* of *Rome*, to be a true *Church*, or else to maintaine that an *unbaptized* person may *baptize*. Now if they stand to denie the *baptisme* in the *Church* of *Rome*, they denie their owne *Baptisme*, which they received successively from thence; which if they doe, (as upon your grounds they are driven thereunto) then how doe you thinke they will raise *baptisme*, except an *unbaptized* person *baptize* another?

Thus you may see into what *streits* they wrap and ensnare themselves, in taking up such groundlesse *Arguments* as you bring, and all to *jullifie* themselves in their own way, and to *avoyd*, and withstand the way of *Seperation*, which is the onely way of *God*.

Whereas you bring in the *disorders* in *Worship* & *government*, which you say, the *Papists* have brought in; I tell you, this is a varying from the matter in hand, yet I say, we ought to learne by the same to *avoyd* them, and all those who seek to *ruinate* the foundation of *Christian Religion*, by calling *darke shadows* upon the *heavenly beauris* and *glorious excellencie*, of *Christs Kingly*, *Priestly*, and *Propheticall office*, and *eclipse* his *Mediatorship*, as if it were lesse then it was before he was manifested in the *flesh*. As if he who hath all *power* both in *heaven* and in *earth*, hath not given so much *authoritie*, as generally and universally to make *Disciples*, and *baptize* them; as the *Saints* of old had to make *Disciples* and *circumcise* them; Surely seeing *Christ* is as *faithfull* in his *house* as *Moses*. As the *Gospel* of *Christ* (in former time) was so effectually and powerfull, as to caule *Profelytes* (and their seed in their *infancie*) to have such *dignitie* (by *vertue* of *Gods covenant*) to

See the
Answer to
A. R. first
part.

be circumcised; The Gospel of Christ (being every lot as glorious as it hath been,) is also as effectually and powerfull now, to dignifie believers, and their infants, with the ordinance of Baptisme, and that by virtue of Gods covenant; unto which is annexed Christs institution, which is very generall, yea, more generall then circumcision was of old. And surely if the infants of believers had that power, as to become the children of God in their infancie, fellow-heires with the Saints in light, as Isaac was, and all those like him were, and to be coe-heires with Jesus Christ, of the everlasting inheritance, kingdome, and glory, and that before Christs resurrection; Then the infants of believers, borne after Christs resurrection, have the like priviledges. But the first is true from the grounds before layd, from their right to the covenant, their being in the covenant, &c. and the unchangeablenesse of the Angel of the covenant. Therefore the latter, that holy infants are still in the covenant, is true also; And this hath been sufficiently proved before.

Touching your Exhortation, how wee should bewaile the great Apostacie, &c. I say, as the Saints of old did bewaile the great Apostacie of the Israelites, both in faith and worship, who were replenished from the East; and were south-sayers, like the Philistians, and pleased themselves in the children of strangers; So wee ought to bewaile this Apostacie of these now.

Na. 2. 6.

Wee have cause to bewaile their ignorance, who pretend holinesse to God, and make a verball profession, drawing neer unto God with their mouthes (like the Apostate Israelites) when their hearts are far from him; pleading for the baptizing of those Infants, whose parents are neither of them believers, causing the holy signe to be administred upon their infants in that idolatrous estate; in the partaking whereof, they have no right, any more then the seed of those Apostates of the Israelites, had right to circumcision in former time.

But yet though the Infants were circumcised in that Idolatrous estate, the Prophets worke was to call them to repentance, and if they returned (the manner of their circumcision being repented of) it was as effectually unto them, as if they had received it in an excellent and holy manner. So those who are baptized in their infancie, in the state of Apostacie, at their conversion are not to be baptized againe; but to repent of the evill of the manner, and not cast away Gods holy institution, but still retaine it, and make a holy use of it, yet they ought not to Idolize it, by preferring it before that which is greater. Though the

Ex. 2. 1. 2.

Temple, and the Altar, and the worshippers, were to be measured, yet the Court without was to be cast out, and not to be measured, because it was given to the Gentiles.

Againe, Whereas you speak of the abrogation of the state of the Jewes. I say, This hath been answered fully before, you should still minde that *Jesus Christ* came not to undermine or overthrow his kingdom, though it was taken out of the hands of the unbelieving Jewes, and given unto another people, whom *Christ* testified, would bring forth fruits of it.

Againe, Whereas you speak of the casting off of *Israel*, according to the flesh.

I answer, That none were cast off meerly because they were *Israelites* according to the flesh; and though some were cut off; yet others remained on, and in that state where the *Gentiles* by faith were planted and placed; as some of the Jewes, through unbelief, were cut off, supplanted, and displaced. So the *Ap. stle Paul* sayth, the Jewes some of them (not all of them) were cut off, because of unbelief, and the believing *Gentiles* grafted in their stead. As for those that believed, their priviledges and prerogatives were still as great, and as large, both to them, and their seed, as they were before. And the like may be sayd concerning the *Profelytes*. And so your other question is resolved, concerning the bringing in of us *Gentiles*, and our seed, as acceptable on *Gods Altar*.

A. R.

And whereas you question againe, Whether the parents, Jew and Gentile, must needs be borne against the Spirit, and onely by faith become the seed of *Abraham*, and heires according to promise. *Gal. 3. 7. 29. Rom. 4. 11. 12.* And shall their children become the same seed by nature?

I answer. The birth of the Spirit is very necessary both to young and old, without which they cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. And I would have you to know, that I plead not that the children of the faithfull become heires of the promise by nature; but by the free grace of God, which passeth all understanding, which is as sufficient for believers, and their children now, as formerly.

And these interrogations of yours are answered at large, you having mentioned the same things before.

Againe, You say:

Neither can any shew any one such promise to any believer, in all the whole world, and his seed, as was and is to *Abraham* and his seed, who is therefore

A. R.
Page 10, lin. 2.
to lin. 10,

therefore the father of us all (as wit) of all beleevers, and onely of beleevers, Jew and Gentile, father and childe, &c. Rom. 4. 16. and therefore it is faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; but the promise is sure onely to beleevers; Therefore beleevers onely are the seed of Abraham, to whom the promise and ordinance of the new Testament doe properly appertaine.

To which I answer, That this hath been answered before already, It hath been proved sufficiently, that the same covenant which was made with Abraham and his seed, is made to beleevers and their seed; & it being a perpetuall covenant, the heires of it are perpetuall heires, even such to whom the promises doe appertaine, as well as unto their deare brethren of old, who are departed in the same faith; and this heavenly order the old Law which was given at Mount Sinai, could not disannull.

And I hope there is no reasonable man, but will condescend unto this, that all those who were to receive the signe and scale of the righteousness of faith, were visibly holy and faithfull; but the Infants of beleevers were, by Gods appointment, to receive the signe, and scale of the righteousness of faith; therefore the Infants of beleevers were then (as they are now) visibly holy and faithfull. And Christian Infants are as capable (every way) of the scale now, as the Infants of the Jewes (Gods holy ones) were capable of the scale in former time.

Therefore the Baptisme of the New Testament, doth properly appertaine unto such; and therefore the administration of Baptisme upon them, doth not overthrow the least part of the Gospel of Christ, or any thing of his, much lesse the whole, as you (in your following words) most falsely speake; and therefore the minor of your following argument, being so small, that there is no truth therein; the conclusion builded thereon, (that that Baptisme* is Antichristian and abominable) is Antichristian and abominable, as well as your comparisons, specified in your first Book, where you compare the Baptisme of Infants with the abominable Hierarchy, Against which imprecations, I must, and will still, as I have done, maintaine the Baptisme of holy Infants to be just and lawfull, holy and Evangelicall; and ought to be observed, according to the command of Christ, Mat 28. 19. Mar. 16. 16. Of which sufficient hath been spoken before, and more may be according as time and occasion shall be offered.

But your bare affirmations, (without prooffe) you take for granted to be very true, and therefore upon this ground, you proceed to make a small conclusion of your Booke, with this Conclusion;

A. R.
His last Con-
clusion.

That the Baptisme of Infants, is the greatest delusion, and a thing of a dangerous consequence, as ever the Man of sinne brought into the world, and therefore the greatest maintainers thereof, are justly to be esteemed the greatest deluders. Wherefore it is high time for us to look about us, to awaken out of this drunken slumber, and to see how hitherto wee and our fathers have been blindly led, by our blind guides, into this depth of ignorance, and mist of iniquitie, and let us seek out by what means, and by whom wee are so miserably intosticated, as to stumble and grope for our way, thus even at noone day.

To which I answer, That it is not materiall or sufficient to say, it is a delusion, except it could be proved to be so; you should know, that it is not a delusion, nor dangerous in the least, much lesse can it be the greatest delusion, and of as dangerous consequence, as ever the Man of sinne brought into the world; as you (without so much as any just consequence) most unjustly conclude; rather wee may conclude, that the greatest with-standers of holy Infants Baptisme, are the greatest deluders; Wherefore I may better conclude against you, that you have done very evill in uttering forth such bitter words, against the Baptisme of holy Infants, before you had seen the premises better welghed in the Ballance of the Sanctuary. And why is it? but because you doe not look upon things with a single eye. Yea, your spirituall sight is so darkened, (or rather that naturall reason which is in you,) that in pushing at Gods people, you push against God, who standeth between you and us; though you (rideing upon the insufficiency of your humane testimony, which will not beare you out) see him not, no more then blinde Balaam saw the Angel of Jehovah, that fought against him; But when your eyes are opened, then you shall see your error, and be enabled to perceive a difference spiritually between the Infants of believers, and the Infants of unbelievers, in respect of a visible state, and reverence the ordinance of Baptisme, administred upon holy Infants, for his sake, who is the Author and Instituter thereof; and no more condemne the generation of the just, who practise the same; and so kick against the prick, and be a fighter (as you are now) against God. But know, that it is no better then sacriledge, to farther Gods holy Institutions upon the Man of sinne.

And seeing the signe & seale of the righteousness of faith, was commanded by God to be imposed upon the Infants of believers, we may justly conclude, That those are deluded by sinne, which say it is a delusion of the Man of sinne; but such prejudicate opinions, as yours are, are the

very suggestions of Sathan; for with the same carnall reason did he possesse Eve; & with the like suggestions hath he violently possessed you; this being as bad as that, if not worse; and therefore those who are most active and famous to withstand the Baptisme of holy Infants, are (if you will have it) the greatest and most grossest deluders, at least (and at the best) they are deluded.

And if you will still determine to hold on, as you have done, saying that the Baptisme of Infants is a meer device, and tradition of man, and brought into the world for politick and by-ends, &c. when it is apparently knowne, that God first brought it into the world; and his love is not selfe-love, neither hath he any other ends, but his own glory, and the good of his people. I say, if you hold on in your peremptory conclusion, that it is a delusion of the Man of sinne, and that the greatest maintainers thereof, are justly to be esteemed the greatest deluders. I must (knowing you to be deluded) desire you to awake out of this [your] drunken slumber; and know, that in all these your fond imaginations, & vain conceptions, you have brought forth a meer dream; When you awake (I hope) you will not finde it so.

AND now for conclusion, I desire you seriously to consider the Scriptures, reasons, and arguments brought by mee to vindicate the lawfulnessse of the Baptisme of holy Infants, against whatsoever objections you have heer set downe in opposition of this Truth. And withall take notice (I pray you) how that throughout both these your Treatises against Infants baptisme, you have not brought one Scripture, from whence wee may draw the least consequence for dismissing the holy Infants from being members of Gods visible church, or for keeping them frō Baptisme (the visible sign of the new Covenant,) extant now, any more then (such holy Infants were exempted in former time from Circumcision: the visible sign of the new Covenant,) extant then. But many, yea, multitudes of plaine and evident testimonies there are, evidently declaring the excellent benefits which appertaine unto them in Jesus Christ; Amongst which, Baptisme is one, which though it be externall, and is not effectuall [of it selfe] to the salvation of any, yet it is a sign (or token) by which God will have all his visible Saints, marked out for the peculiar sheep of his owne pasture.

And if holy Infants were not to be baptized, as holy Infants formerly were to be circumcised before Christ was manifested in the flesh,

flesh; then it would argue a great weaknes, or imperfection in Christ, eclipsing his Mediatorship, as if he were not so able to make this as profitable unto these (in their infancie) as Circumcision was unto the other (in their infancie) importing as if Christ were not so faithfull in his house, as Moses, and as if Baptisme were of smaller value, and of lesse effect then Circumcision.

But Baptisme is as generall and as effectuall every manner of way as Circumcision, therefore as Circumcision was not worne out from the Infants of beleevers, but was so permanent, that it remained till Christs first coming, and till he took away the Ceremonies of the old Law; so Baptisme hath not, nor shall not be taken away from these, but remaine as permanent with them, till Christ (who was once an Infant like them) come againe in the Clouds of heaven, with power and great glory, descending with his shouting Troopes of heavenly Hosts; When the heavens from above, and hell from beneath, shall be emptied of those immortall soules and spirits which are therein, When your owne eyes shall behold our Emanuel, either to your glory, or confusion; at which time, all the dead both small and great, Infants as well as others, shall be seen to stand before God to be judged; Then shall there be a seperation between the precious, and the vile, when Jesus Christ, our sweet Saviour, (the very beautie of holinesse, the brightnesse of his Fathers glory, and the expresse image of his person) shall invite the blessed babes of beleeving parents, (together with the rest of his sheep) to receive the substance of all his ordinances, the accomplishment of all his promises, the enjoyment of that glorious and immortall estate, that unchangeable and perpetuall supream inheritance, which shall never be worne out, or taken away, but remaine from everlasting to everlasting.



F I N I S.

A COPY OF A

LETTER,

FROM THE

MEMBERS

OF BOTH HOUSES

Assembled at

OXFORD,

To the

EARLE OF ESSEX:

Dated the 27 of January, 1643.

WITH

The names of those who Signed it, desiring
a Treaty of P E A C E.

Printed by Order, to be published to the whole Kingdom.
EDW. NORGATE,

Printed at OXFORD, Iannary 30.

By LEONARD LIGHTFIELD, Printer

At 6:8. to the University. 1643.

*England
Lords House
1643*